

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



Regulations Regarding Theses and Dissertations

[illegible]



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Carlton1965>

78625
1965-1
H 10

UKRAINIAN LOANWORDS IN POLISH

By

Terence Roy Carlton

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVONIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

September, 1965

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Ukrainian Loanwords in Polish" submitted by Terence Roy Carlton in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Date

Sept. 17, 1965

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
1207 EAST 58TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. 773-936-5000



Ukrainian Loanwords in Polish

(An Abstract and an Introduction)

The influence of the Polish language on Ukrainian is an established fact of long standing in Slavic studies; the other side of the coin, that is, Ukrainian influence on Polish, is not so generally recognized, for it has never been fully investigated. This thesis deals with one phase of that influence, namely, the field of loanwords. Ukrainian influence in fields such as phonetics, morphology, and folklore is only mentioned in passing and only with a view to proving the origin of any given lexeme.

This thesis documents the existence of a considerable number of Ukrainian loanwords in literary Polish. This is accomplished by investigating all previous research in the field and by studying the historical background of Ukrainian-Polish linguistic relationships. Such research allows us to establish several criteria for identifying and proving that certain lexemes are, in fact, Ukrainian loanwords. These methods of proof include the following: the testimony of authoritative scholars in the science of etymology (Bruckner, Sławski, Vasmer, Doroszewski, etc.); historical data; evidence of source (i.e., the biography of the earliest known user of a word), of phonology, and of meaning (the loanword may have a distinct connection with Ukrainian history, geography, botany, or cookery). By applying these methods, 561 Ukrainian loanwords are compiled and given in the final chapter of this work.

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	i
Transliteration	ii
I History of the Investigation of the Problem	1
II The Attitude Toward Ukrainianisms in Pre-Partition Poland ..	11
III Methodological Remarks	27
A. Methods of Proof	27
1. Testimony of Recognized Authorities	27
(a) Polish Etymological Works	28
(b) Ukrainian Etymological Works	31
2. Evidence of Chronology	34
3. Evidence of Meaning	37
4. Evidence of Source	37
5. Evidence of Phonology	38
B. Methods of Distinguishing Ukrainianisms from Other East Slavic Borrowings	46
C. Criteria for Establishing Ukrainian as the Intermediary in Borrowings from Other Languages	48
IV The Treatment of Ukrainian Phonemes in Polish	51
V Dictionary of Ukrainianisms in Polish	67
A Bibliography	129

Preface

The purpose of this thesis is to demonstrate that the Ukrainian language exerted a considerable influence on the vocabulary of modern literary Polish.

This study deals with the problem of Ukrainian loanwords in Polish in three stages: the first chapter gives a general outline of all previous research in the field; the second examines the historical background of Ukrainian-Polish linguistic relationships; then the data discussed in the two preceding chapters are evaluated critically in order to establish reliable criteria for identifying and proving Ukrainianisms in literary Polish; finally, strict application of these criteria allows the writer to document the existence of 561 Ukrainian borrowings which are listed alphabetically in chapter five of this thesis.

The value of this study lies in the fact that, by compiling existing research, it proves a considerable Ukrainian contribution to the lexicon of Polish--a fact known for some time but poorly documented. This work will also serve as a basis for further research in this field, for it establishes definite methods and criteria for dealing with this problem.

TRANSLITERATION

The following AATSEEL transliteration system will be used in this thesis:

А а	a	Ј ј	j	Ц ц	c
Б б	b	К к	k	Ч ч	č
В в	v	Ќ к	ќ	Џ ѓ	dž (SC, M)
Г г	g (U, BR)	Л л	l	Ш ш	š
Г г	g, h (U, BR)	Љ љ	lj (SC, M)	Щ щ	šč, št (B, CS)
Ѓ г	g (M)	М м	m	Ъ ъ	", ə (B)
Д д	d	Н н	n	Ы ы	y
Ђ ђ	dj (SC)	Њ њ	nj (SC, M)	Ь ь	'
Е е	e	О о	o	Ѣ ѣ	ě
Ё ё	ë	П п	p	Э э	è
Є є	je (U)	Р р	r	Ю ю	ju
Ј љ	je (SC)	С с	s	Я я	ja
Ж ж	ž	Т т	t	А а	e (CS)
З з	z	Ћ ћ	ć (SC)	Ѧ ѧ	je (CS)
Ѕ ѕ	dz (M, CS)	У у	u	Ѩ ѩ	q (CS)
И и	i, y (U)	Ў ў	w (BR)	Ѫ ѫ	jq (CS)
І і	i	Ф ф	f		
Ї ї	ji (U)	Х х	x		
Й й	j				

B - Bulgarian

R - Russian

BR - Belorussian

SC - Serbo-Croatian

CS - Church Slavonic,
Common Slavic

U - Ukrainian

M - Macedonian

This system will be used consistently, with the following exceptions:

1. Anglicized words such as ruble, kopek, kolkhoz, sovkhos, Bolshevik, soviet, calash, troika, tsar, boyar, droshky (these spellings will be used, except in linguistic or quoted Cyrillic text, in which case the words will be transliterated according to the table above).
2. The names of individuals who have accepted a Latin-alphabet spelling (e.g., Mirsky).
3. Bibliographical references to materials published in non-Cyrillic languages (e.g., The Letters of Chekhov, as the title of the English-language publication only).
4. Geographical names in widely accepted usage in Anglicized spelling (e.g., Yalta, Moscow).
5. In proto-Slavic, Old Church Slavonic and Old Rus' forms, the jers (ѣ, ѥ) are not transliterated.

History of the Investigation of the Problem

As far as can be ascertained, the first mention of Ukrainian influence on Polish was made in 1767 by a Polish writer, S. Kleczewski. He greatly exaggerated this influence and came out strongly in favor of "following the example of our ancestors by borrowing from Ukrainian," or to use Kleczewski's own terminology, z-ruska słowiański [sic].

Giving the Polish equivalent form in brackets, he cited the following words:

kimbał (cymbał), łodzia (łódź), kałamat (bałamut), liszen (lichy), popeł (popiół), postelia (pościel), posuplen (posepny), prawyło (prawidło), propast [no Polish form cited], swiaszczennyk [no Polish form cited], smiach (śmiech), stojanie (stajnia), stebłyje (ździebło), stołp (słup), styd (wstyd), atro (jutro), jazyk (język), krypki (krzepki albo mocny), tworo₂ (stwarzam), tajō (taję), sochraniō (ochraniam), soprotajō (uprzątam).

As is evident from these examples, Kleczewski's observations have historical value only, as their scholarly value is questionable, to say the least. Any truly Ukrainian forms--posuplen, prawyło, propast, stołp, styd, swiaszczennyk--are unknown in modern literary Polish although they may have been current in the usage of Polish speakers in Lwów at that time.³

Curious indeed is the form smiach where proto-Slavic ě is rendered as ja which is a feature of modern Bulgarian, not of Ukrainian.⁴ Even

¹S. Kleczewski, O początku, dawności, odmianach y wydoskonaleniu języka polskiego zdania (Lwów, 1767), p. 6.

²Ibid., pp. 6-7. Due to the large number of foreign words in this quotation, underlining is not used here, or in subsequent similar quotations.

³J. Rudnyc'kyj, Lemberger ukrainische Stadtmundart (Leipzig, 1943), pp. 82-88.

⁴K.K. Trofymovyč, Praktykum z porivnjal'noji hramatyky slovjans'kyx mov (L'viv, 1960), pp. 31 and 41.

more curious are the two verb forms *sochranijo* (<szxrańq) and *soprotajo* (<szprętajq).⁵ The development of the suffix **sŭ>so* is a feature of Church Slavonic pronunciation.⁶ If Kleczewski did, in fact acquire these verbs from this source, how do we explain the fact that both the proto-Slavic nasals (**e, o*) are rendered as *o*? The usual practice in the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic is to render **e* as *ja* and **o* as *u* which corresponds to the actual historical development of Ukrainian; and this, of course, has influenced the pronunciation of the liturgical language.⁷ It is difficult to imagine where Kleczewski heard Church Slavonic words pronounced as he transcribed them. It is still more difficult to believe that forms like these were once commonly used in Polish. Unfortunately, Kleczewski has nothing to say which would answer these very perplexing questions.

The next reference to East Slavic influence on Polish appeared in 1776 in^a work by M. Dudziński. The examples cited by him are much more convincing than those given by Kleczewski.

There are many East Slavic words used in the Polish language. Some examples are: *hledzę, wielmi, zabywam, sobaka, chata, duszno, hołubek, sierdzyty, sierdżę się, horuję, mołojec, nieduży* [not strong], *odzieża, chwost, mać, mir*, etc.

⁵L. Sadnik and R. Aitzetmüller, Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchen-slawischen Texten ('s-Gravenhage and Heidelberg, 1955), pp. 127, 130.

⁶D. Popovyč, Hramatyka cerkovno-slovjans'koji movy v ukrajins'kij redakciji (Mundare, Alberta, 1958), p. 20. For the history of this pronunciation see: L.P. Jakubinskij, Istorija drevnerusskogo jazyka (Moscow, 1953), p. 144.

⁷Popovyč, Hramatyka..., p. 19.

⁸M. Dudziński, Zbiór rzeczy potrzebniejszych do wydoskonalenia się w ojczystym języku służących (Wilno, 1776), p. 93.

As evident from the phonetics, most of the examples cited are Belorussian borrowings. A few, however, exhibit Ukrainian features such as the absence of akanie in the words sobaka, hołubek, horuje, mołojec.

On the Ukrainian side, the first to mention Ukrainian influence on Polish was M. Kucyj in 1857.

At that time [before the Church Union of 1596], the good Poles often obtained nourishment from our language. As they themselves say, they drew many words from it and they often eased their noble cares and longings with our inexpressibly beautiful songs.⁹

Oddly enough, he gave no examples of loanwords adopted by Polish from Ukrainian.

The first real step in the investigation of East Slavic influence on Polish was made by V.V. Makušev, a Russian, in an article published in Moscow some twenty years later.¹⁰ This author deserves this honour, for it was he who wrote the first full-length article devoted exclusively to this problem, while all his predecessors confined themselves to a few passing remarks on it while dealing with some other topic. Unfortunately, this article is now a bibliographic rarity of the highest order, and one can learn about it only through some brief comments of the Polish lexicographer, A. Kryński, who reviewed it.¹¹ Judging from Kryński's remarks, the article, although containing much valuable information, seems to have greatly exaggerated the influence of "Ruthenian" on

⁹M. Kucyj, Użynok ridnoho polja (Moscow, 1857), p. 22.

¹⁰V.V. Makušev, "Sledy russkago vlijanija na pol'skuju pis'mennost'," Slavjanskij sbornik, III (1878).

¹¹A. Kryński, "Z dziejów języka polskiego. Objaśnienia do rozprawy W.W. Makuševa", Ateneum, I (1879).

Polish. Kryński, on the other hand, apparently for patriotic reasons, denied almost all influence from that quarter.

In 1885 J. Hanusz published an article in which he drew attention to the fact that many Turko-Tataric words/^{had}entered Polish through Ukrainian.¹²

For certain, many Eastern words reached us only through the intermediacy of the Ukrainian language which even today contains vast numbers of Eastern words that are almost entirely unknown to us.

Hanusz then goes on to cite some of the so-called Eastern words used in Ukrainian but not in Polish. Yet, he gives no examples of those Turko-Tataric loanwords for which Ukrainian acted as the intermediary.¹³

Four years later the Ukrainian scholar, P. Žytec'kyj speculated in a general way about Ukrainian influence on Polish. He indicated two ways by which Ukrainianisms could have entered Polish--through Polonized Ukrainians or through Poles from the Ukraine such as Rej, Szymonowicz, and Zimorowicz.¹⁴

The first person to investigate this question in any depth, however, was the great Polish scholar, Alexander Bruckner, who dealt with the

¹²J. Hanusz, "O wpływie języków wschodnich na słownik języka polskiego", Prace Filologiczne, I (1885), pp. 465-66.

¹³Hanusz himself never used the term ukraiński, but he did differentiate between the three East-Slavic languages, using ruski for Ukrainian, rosyjski for Russian and białoruski or białoruteński for Belorussian.

¹⁴P. Žyteckij, Očerki literaturnoj istorii malorusskogo narečija v XVII v. (Kiev, 1889). Information is cited from the Ukrainian translation of this work: Narys literaturnoji istoriji ukrajins'koji movy v XVII vici (L'viv, 1941), p. 37.

problem in a number of works.¹⁵ The main defect in these otherwise excellent works was Bruckner's capricious use of the term ruski which he used in the sense of Russian, Belorussian, Ukrainian, or common East Slavic. Another fault is that the author, for chauvinistic reasons, purposely plays down the importance of Ukrainian or of East Slavic influence in general. Here is Bruckner's evaluation:

Some have maintained that many a Polish word came to us from Lithuanian or Ukrainian, but there are never borrowings of words from a group on a lower level of culture and power unless in a border region we may find some purely local exchange of certain terms. Borrowings from Ukrainian are, for the most part, later and of local importance only.¹⁶

Despite centuries of contact over vast areas, despite Polish colonization throughout all Rus', Ukrainian influence is quite inconsequential and local. In general the less the Pole accepted from the Rusin, the more the Rusin accepted from the Pole. The deciding factor here, as usual, was cultural superiority.

The newest borrowings from Ukrainian and Russian are also inconsequential and, for the most part, vulgar, having no place in the literary language.¹⁷

¹⁵"Cywilizacja i język. Szkice z dziejów kultury polskiej," Biblioteka Warszawska, II and III (1893), pp. 396-408 and 445-455; Cywilizacja i język; Szkice z dziejów obyczajowości polskiej (Warsaw, 1901), pp. 93-96; Dzieje języka polskiego (Lwów, 1906), pp. 82, 142-145 (2nd ed., 1913 pp. 60-61, 118-120; 3rd ed., 1925, pp. 149 and 250-255); "Wpływy języków obcych na język polski. Wpływy ruskie, wpływy wschodnie", Encyklopedia polska (Cracow, 1915), II, Sec. III, part I, Chapter 9, 10. Walka o język (Lwów, 1917), pp. 155, 216-218, 245-261; Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego (Cracow, 1927; 2nd ed., Warsaw, 1957).

¹⁶"Cywilizacja...", Biblioteka Warszawska, II, p. 393.

¹⁷"Wpływy języków obcych na język polski...", p. 140-141.

In his review of the second edition of Bruckner's Dzieje języka polskiego,¹⁸ J. Rozwadowski, the great Polish Slavacist, took Bruckner to task for treating such a serious problem in such a cavalier fashion:

And how does Bruckner deal with such an important fact as the union of Poland with Lithuania and Rus'? Some ten or fifteen Ukrainian terms in Polish and that's the end of the story! That's how this historian of Polish culture views a fact of such gigantic significance, a fact which weighed so heavily on the course of history, on the development¹⁹ of the culture and soul, and also on the language of our people.

Nitsch, the famous Polish dialectologist, also mentions Bruckner's chauvinism and especially his anti-Ukrainian attitude.²⁰ Contrasting sharply with Bruckner, he says:

Czech influence was purely literary and touched only one, although an important, epoch. Although, perhaps, not as strong as the influence in the opposite direction, Ukrainian influence on Polish was, nevertheless, of the most basic nature and has lasted to the present day.²¹

In another place in the same article, Nitsch speaks of Ukrainian influence as being "vibrant, many-sided, and based on five uninterrupted centuries

¹⁸See p. 5, fn. 25, above.

¹⁹J. Rozwadowski, "Recenzja z wydania 'Dziejów języka polskiego' Brucknera," Język Polski, XIV (1914), p. 92.

²⁰K. Nitsch, "Wspomnienia", Język Polski, LIX (1959), p. 359.

²¹Nitsch, "Przyczynki do charakterystyki polskich czechizmów," Sbornik v čest na prof. L. Miletič za sedemdesetgodistinata ot roždenie mu (Sofia, 1933), p. 242.

of living together."²²

Nevertheless, in all fairness to Bruckner, it must be stated that he was too great a scholar to distort or ignore any facts. Although personally he may have preferred it otherwise, his works definitely prove a considerable Ukrainian influence on Polish. This is clearly demonstrated by Klich's statistical analysis of Bruckner's etymological dictionary.²³ From a total of 25,467 entries, Klich counted 374 labelled ruskie, or 1.4% of the total. For the sake of a comparison he also counted the number of German borrowings, which amounted to 1,354 or 5.4% of the total. Klich's percentages, however, cannot be taken at face value but require further qualification. The figure 25,476 represents the total number of entries--both roots and derivatives and only proper names are excluded from the count, while the figures 374 and 1,354 represent roots only. Klich's statistics, therefore, have only an orientational value.

Because of Bruckner's ambiguous use of the term ruski, Klich was unable to calculate the number of borrowings from the individual East Slavic languages. However, on the basis of his own investigations, Klich stated that "the vast majority of these borrowings are, in fact, of Ukrainian origin."²⁴

²²Ibid., p. 247, and in "O wzajemnym stosunku gwar ludowych i języka literackiego. Wpływ prowincji ruskich na polszczyznę literacką," Język Polski, XIII (1913), pp. 790-83. It is well to point out here that Nitsch did not use the term ukrainiski but ruski. Nevertheless, he is consistent, and it is evident from the context that he was referring to Ukrainian, not to East Slavic languages in general.

²³E. Klich, "Recenzja 'Słownika etymologicznego języka polskiego' Brucknera," Slavia Occidentalis, VII (1927), pp. 493-510.

²⁴Ibid., p. 503.

Klich was also the first to investigate statistically the chronology of Ukrainian borrowings in Polish. As the statistics cited above, he compiled his information solely on the basis of Bruckner's etymological dictionary. Klich's study, therefore, reflects the same weakness previously described in Bruckner's work. Nevertheless, it is interesting to summarize briefly Klich's findings. He reckoned that Polish borrowed one word from the East Slavic languages before the fifteenth century, ten in the 1560's. The high water mark was reached in the seventeenth century with two hundred and eleven borrowings, with only six in the next century and ten in the nineteenth.²⁵

Lehr-Spławiński also made a valuable contribution to the investigation of this problem in 1928 when he delivered a lecture on this topic at the University of Lwów. This lecture was published the same year.²⁶ It appeared again ten years later in an improved and enlarged version in a collection of articles by the same author.²⁷ He also made a few remarks concerning this question in the first edition of Język polski; pochodzenie, powstanie, rozwój.²⁸ In the second edition, however, he treats the problem in more detail under such headings as:

Ukrainian-Belorussian Influence in the Sixteenth and the First Half of the Seventeenth Century; Ukrainian-Belorussian Influence

²⁵Klich, "Pożyczki ruskie w języku polskim," Slavia Occidentalis, VIII (1929), p. 507.

²⁶T. Lehr-Spławiński, "Wzajemne wpływy polsko-ruskie w dziedzinie językowej," Przegląd Współczesny (Cracow, 1928), pp. 18-50.

²⁷"Wzajemne wpływy polsko-ruskie w dziedzinie językowej," Szkice z dziejów rozwoju i kultury języka polskiego (Lwów, 1938), pp. 105-127.

²⁸Język polski; pochodzenie, powstanie, rozwój, (Warsaw, 1947), pp. 277-278.

in the Second Half of the Seventeenth and the First Half of the Eighteenth Century; The Language of Poles from Ukraine and Belorussia.²⁹

In 1934 M. Rudzińska published an article in which she examined briefly some forty Ukrainian loanwords with their Polish derivatives.³⁰ The importance of this short article lies in the fact that it was the first work to deal exclusively with Ukrainianisms instead of East Slavic borrowings as a whole.

For some time, I. Ziłyński had toyed with the idea of writing a detailed study of Ukrainian-Polish linguistic relations. However, his death shortly after the Second World War rendered this impossible; nevertheless, he did manage to publish one short article on the topic.³¹

A year later appeared an extremely thorough description of the Polish language in Belorussia and the Ukraine during the first century of Polish administration in those territories.³² In three hundred and eighteen detailed pages the author, A. Martel, examines every possible facet of this problem. In particular he treats the following aspects: the Polish language as a vehicle of culture, literature, and administration; its influence on neighbouring languages and vice versa; the effects of these influences on the phonology and morphology of Polish; lexical borrowings and loans with neighbouring languages; and

²⁹Język polski; pochodzenie, powstanie, rozwój (2nd ed., Warsaw, 1951), pp. 277-298, 437-438.

³⁰M. Rudzińska, "Przyczynek do stosunków językowych polsko-ukraińskich," Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego, IV (1934), pp. 22-27.

³¹I. Ziłyński, "Vzajemovidnosyny miž ukrajins'koju ta pol's'koju movoju," Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Ševčenko, CLV (1937), pp. 203-215.

³²A. Martel, La Langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes: Ukraine et Russie blanche, 1569-1667 (Lille, 1938).

the contribution of this regional variety of Polish to the development of the literary language. Although almost thirty years old, the monograph still has no serious rivals.

The last major work devoted exclusively to the question is S. Hrabec's careful study of several kresowi writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³³ From the title one sees that Hrabec's work is much more specific than Martel's. Hrabec deals exclusively with Ukrainian influence as manifested in Polish literature within a definite time and area. Martel similarly deals with the Polish language, but he describes its status and structure in all the fields where a language can be utilized.

Finally, one must mention two more recent but less extensive works in this field. In 1959, Y. Šerech-Shevelov published a short monograph dealing with the whole problem of Ukrainian-Polish linguistic relations, but with special emphasis on the phenomenon of phonetic contamination.³⁴ Three years later M.J. Onyškevyč, another Ukrainian scholar, published an article which investigates common East Slavic loanwords in Polish.³⁵ From a total of nine pages, only three deal exclusively with Ukrainian borrowings. These few pages are, at present, the last word in the story of Ukrainian influence on Polish.

³³S. Hrabec, Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy XVI i XVII w. (Toruń, 1949).

³⁴Y. Šerech-Shevolov, "The Problem of Ukrainian-Polish Linguistic Relations from the Tenth to Fourteenth Centuries," Word (supp. Slavic Word, No. 1) VIII, No. 4 (December, 1952), pp. 227-249.

³⁵M.J. Onyškevyč, "Slova sxidnoslovjans'koho poxodžennja v pol'skij movi," Voprosy slavjanskogo jasykoznanija, No. 4 (L'viv, 1955), pp. 148-156.

The Attitude Toward Ukrainianisms in Pre-Partition Poland

The purpose of this chapter is to survey briefly the material which sheds some light on the cultural climate responsible for Ukrainian borrowings in Polish in the period from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.

Before examining this question in the light of specific examples and quotations, some general historic background about the Polish Empire in the late feudal age (from the sixteenth to the mid-eighteenth century) must be given. Otherwise, the modern reader will be hard-pressed to understand the rather favorable Polish attitude toward the Ukrainian language in a period constantly marred by intensely bitter and bloody conflicts between the two nationalities. This seems rather strange to the modern mind so accustomed to regard the similarity of languages as a key factor in determining such vital things as loyalty, patriotism, and even nationhood. According to R.R. Palmer, the credo of this new nationalism, which developed in the nineteenth century from the teachings of J.G. Herder (1744-1803),¹ can be summarized in two basic points:

Governing authorities.... should be of the same nationality, i.e., language, as those they govern. All persons of the same nationality, i.e., language, should be encompassed within the same state.²

One does not have to be an accomplished historian to see how deeply these concepts have influenced European history since about 1800. All our ideas about national states and national loyalties, based as they are on those principles, are intimately connected with language.

¹R.R. Palmer, A History of the Modern World (New York, 1958), pp. 402-426 and 438.

²Ibid., p. 438.

However, we must not allow the force of these modern ideas to obscure some very basic facts about Polish social structure and values before the partitions. Poland at that time was not a modern national state but a feudal empire. The loyalties of its citizens, therefore, were based on the traditional feudal values of allegiance to one's own class and fidelity to one's liege. The citizen of feudal Poland, as feudal people elsewhere, attached no significance at all to the native language of his liege or his fellow-noblemen. Loyalties went according to rank and religion, not language.³

Therefore, when Ukrainian historians speak of the Polonization of the Ukrainian nobility, the reader must be careful to understand this in the feudal context in which it took place. This simply means that, in the interest of class solidarity and the retention of class privileges, the less numerous Orthodox, i.e., Ukrainian nobility accepted Roman Catholicism, the religion of the majority. Thus, "Polonization," in fact, meant basically an assimilation in religion, not in language.⁴

This is not really surprising, for at that time (the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries) there was simply no unified national language to which to assimilate. Like so many other East European peoples,

³An interesting example of this was the Peace of Paris (1763). The French Government went to considerable pains to secure from the British a guarantee of religious liberty for the Catholic colonists of Quebec, but there is no mention whatever of language rights. See "Paris, Treaty of (1763)," Encyclopedia Canadiana, VIII (1958), pp. 105-106.

⁴National allegiance based on religion instead of language must have been very deeply ingrained in the population, for it exists even to this day among second and third-generation Ukrainians in Canada. While teaching elementary school in Slavic communities in Saskatchewan, the author of this study often had occasion to fill out records in which the pupils were required to state, among other things, their "mother tongue" and "national origin." In many cases they would give "Ukrainian" as their mother tongue, but "Polish" as their national origin. When asked to explain this anomaly, they argued that they had to be Polish because they attended the "Polish Church," i.e., the Roman Catholic Church.

neither the Poles nor the Ukrainians had as yet developed a standard literary language with set rules for orthography, grammatical norms, lexicon, etc., and this fact is of the utmost significance in the whole problem of Ukrainian-Polish linguistic relationships. The fact that both languages were in a formative state greatly aided their mutual interaction, for once a dialect solidifies into a literary language, it develops a protective crust of established norms and standards which make it less susceptible to outside influences.⁵

The type of Polonization referred to above was quite extensive. M. Hrushevsky reports that by the end of the fifteenth century most of the Orthodox nobility in Galicia, Kholm and Podolia had accepted Catholicism, and by the early part of the sixteenth century so had most of the Orthodox nobility in Volhynia and along the Dnieper.⁶ The fact that this new "Polish" nobility would continue for some time to speak Ukrainian would in no way make it less acceptable to the Polish-speaking majority since they were all of one class and one faith. Such a situation was obviously very conducive to mutual linguistic influences.

⁵ Compare, for example, the vast difference in the degree of influence between Greek and Latin * on the one hand, and French and Anglo-Saxon ** on the other.

* See P.S. Costas, An Outline of the History of the Greek Language (Chicago, 1936), pp. 30 and 77, and L.R. Palmer, The Latin Language (London, 1954), pp. 81-84, 100-102, and 186-187.

** See A.C. Baugh, A History of the English Language (New York, 1957), pp. 127-149, 200-209, and 213-215.

⁶ M. Hrushevsky, A History of Ukraine (New Haven, 1943), pp. 193-197.

The influx of Ukrainianisms into Polish speech was also greatly facilitated by the fact that the southeastern region of the Polish Empire was the richest and also the most turbulent part of the nation. Consequently the great feudal families from that area played a very prominent role in the life of the nation. All these people spoke Polish with a considerable Ukrainian coloration.⁷ Who could object to Ukrainianisms when they appeared even in the speech of such eminent families as the Jagiełłos, the Radziwiłłs, the Sapiehas, the Sieniawskis, Żółkiewiczes, Wiśniowieckis or the Sobieskis?⁸

The earliest reference to borrowings from Ukrainian occurs in 1566 in Górnicki's famous work, Dworzanin polski (The Polish Courtier), in which he offers the following oft-quoted advice about loanwords:

And now turning to the question of language, if the courtier is short of words in Polish, he does well to borrow from Czech sooner than from any other language because among us it is accepted and regarded as the very finest... . Whenever it happens that the word in Czech is awkward, then in its place a Ruthenian or Croatian or Serbian word may be easier for a Pole to understand. In this respect it will be better for the courtier to act on the basis of his own opinion and select from these other languages the easiest and most appropriate word and forget about the Czech.⁹

From the above it is quite evident that by the middle of the sixteenth century Czech had attained a very high position in the hierarchy of sources for new words. So highly was Czech regarded, that Górnicki thought it necessary to remind his readers that there were other sources, and among them, Ukrainian (ruski in Górnicki's terminology). He takes a

⁷T. Lehr-Spławiński, Język polski; pochodzenie, powstanie, rozwój (Warsaw, 1951), pp. 278-297.

⁸Ibid.

⁹L. Górnicki, Dworzanin polski (Cracow, 1566). The passages in question can be found in W. Taszycki, Wybór tekstów staropolskich XVI-XVIII wieku (Warsaw, 1955), p. 66.

similar position in regard to Latin, and describes it as "elevated" and at the "pinnacle of excellence".¹⁰ As with Czech, however, the sophisticated courtier is cautioned to retain a sense of proportion in the use of foreign words. Górnicki advises: "And, therefore, where there is a good Polish word, one does wrong to put a Latin word in its place,"¹¹ or at another point, he states that "it does not strike me as bad when a new word is coined on a Polish basis or one word is created by joining two Polish ones!"¹² Gornicki's attitude to loanwords, therefore, is quite liberal, with Latin and Czech still holding positions of honour, and several other languages (especially the Slavic languages) receiving an honourable mention. As yet there is no sign of that peculiar purist tendency which attempts to cleanse the native language of all foreign impurities. His statements are certainly reasonable and serve to emphasize his common-sense approach to the problem of loanwords.

This liberal attitude seems to have been quite widespread; it was even held by Stanisław Orzechowski who is well-known in Polish literary history for his rather rabid nationalism:¹³

Thereby, I ask you not to take offence if while reading you happen to come upon a Bulgarian word, many of which I had to use because of a deficiency in the Polish language for those things which have never been heard of in Poland before. In any event, in Polish we

¹⁰Ibid., p. 68.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 66-67.

¹²Taszycki, Wybór tekstów, p. 66.

¹³M. Kridl, A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture (The Hague, 1955), p. 87.

add German and Latin words for what we cannot express in Polish.¹⁴ By Bulgarian, Orzechowski is obviously referring to Church Slavonic words, and his use of them is noted and documented by Hrabec.¹⁵ Being a native of Przemyśl, Orzechowski had ample opportunity to familiarize himself with Church Slavonic literature (in its Ukrainian redaction), and his violent opposition to celibacy for the Roman Catholic clergy made him very sympathetic to Orthodoxy.¹⁶

The absorption of Ukrainian and Belorussian words into Polish was greatly aided by an opinion generally held by the Poles that these languages were not really foreign, that they were, so to speak, members of the family, and as such no barriers were erected against them. A good example of this attitude is seen in the foreword to Szymon Budny's translation of the Bible (the so-called Biblia nieświeska, 1572). Here Budny places Ukrainian and Belorussian (ruskie - in his terminology) on the same plane with any other Polish dialect although perhaps reservedly indicating its remoteness. Although he lists Ukrainian as just another Polish dialect, he does say "and even Ukrainian" (in the original - "a bez mała ruskie"):

Concerning the use of the Polish language, you should know that our Poles in writing generally use the language of the region of which they are native. But I have not kept this custom because the translation was not for any one region or province but for all;

¹⁴S. Orzechowski, Policyja Królestwa Polskiego na kształt Aristoteles-owych Polityk wypisana... trzema księgami, etc. (Edited with a preface by Count A.T. Dziatyński) (Poznań, 1859) p. 105.

¹⁵S. Hrabec, Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy XVI i XVII w. (Toruń, 1949), p. 55.

¹⁶Bruckner, "Wpływy języków obcych na język polski," Encyklopedia polska, 11. Sec. 3, part 1, p. 136. (Cracow, 1915).

therefore, we have not selected any particular features of the dialects. Here you will find Great Polish words; you will find¹⁷ Cracovian, Mazovian, Podlasian, Sędomirian, and even Ukrainian.

Even those who opposed foreign borrowings were prepared to grant a special status to Ukrainianisms (and other Slavic loanwords). Grzegorz Knapski, continuing Górnicki's tradition, in the foreword to his Thesaurus Polono-Latino-Graecus of 1621, condemned the excessive use of Latin, Italian, German, Hungarian, and Turkish words in Polish, but he added this significant exception:

However, I exclude Ukrainian and other Slavic tongues [i.e., from the list of interdigited languages] which are not so very different from our own.¹⁸

It is interesting that Knapski singled out Ukrainian from among the other Slavic languages. Obviously, he regarded it as occupying a privileged position as a source for loanwords. It is also interesting that he did not consider Ukrainian as simply a dialect of Polish, although this view was still the commonly-held opinion among Poles, as it was in Budny's time.

Almost a century after the appearance of Budny's Biblia nieświeska, that astute French traveller, Pierre Chevalier, published in Paris his famous discourse on the Cossacks.¹⁹ In discussing their mores he had an interesting comment about their language:

The language of the Cossacks is one of the Polish dialects; and, like Polish, it is a Slavic language. It is very tender, full

¹⁷H. Merczyng, Szymon Budny, jako krytyk tekstów biblijnych (Cracow, 1913), p. 59.

¹⁸G. Knapski, Thesaurus Polono-Latino-Graecus (Cracow, 1621), p. xii.

¹⁹P. Chevalier, Histoire de la guerre des Cosaques contre la Pologne avec un discours de leur origine, pays, moeurs, gouvernement et religion, et un autre des Tartares précopètes. (Paris, 1663).

of diminutive forms and extraordinarily subtle expressions.²⁰

Chevalier observed the war, which he described in such detail, from the Polish side of the front and often had recourse to Polish sources and opinions.²¹ His statement about the language of the Cossacks, in all likelihood, reflected contemporary Polish thinking on the matter. It is indeed noteworthy that even at the height of Polish-Cossack hostilities and religious hatreds, there was no apparent animosity toward the Ukrainian language.²² On the contrary, the climate for borrowings would still be extremely favourable since it was regarded as merely a tender and expressive dialect of the native language. There was, in short, no emotional barrier blocking the entry of Ukrainianisms into Polish.

Another factor indicative of the favourable attitude toward the Ukrainian language greatly aiding the dissemination of Ukrainian words in medieval Poland was the popularity of Ukrainian folk songs at that time.

Although, as Bruckner informs us, Ukrainian musicians and singers were a constant feature at the court of the Jagiellonians (1386-1572),²³

²⁰From a Ukrainian translation^{of}/Chevalier's book: Istorija vijny kozakiv proty Pol'shči (Kiev, 1960), p. 49.

²¹Ibid., pp. 8-9, 162-163.

²²In direct contrast to this, compare, for example, the restrictions enacted against the use of the German language in the United States during World War I* or the War Time Election Act in Canada, 1917, which "denied the franchise to ... those of European birth speaking an enemy alien language and naturalized since 1902."**

*See M. Sullivan, Our Times, The United States 1900-1925, Vol. V, Over Here 1914-1918 (New York, 1933), pp. 474-477.

**See A.R.M. Lower, Colony to Nation (Toronto, 1957), p. 465.

²³A. Bruckner, Mikołaj Rej. Studium krytyczne (Cracow, 1905), p. 24.

the first direct reference to Ukrainian folklore does not occur until 1587 in the Annales... of S. Sarnicki. There, in describing the heroic death of the Strus brothers in a battle against the Moldavians in 1506, he states, "Even now they still sing elegies [about the brothers], which the Ruthenians call dumas."²⁴

Since that time, i.e., the late sixteenth century, references to Ukrainian songs and dumas in Polish sources are encountered with ever increasing frequency, and Ukrainian peasants and Cossacks are frequent characters in the school dramas, the interludes and comedies of wandering players.²⁵ Here we find not only isolated words but whole phrases, monologues, dialogues, and songs in Ukrainian such as the humorous banter of Klimko and Stecko in the interludes of Gawatowicz (1619), the oration of the Cossack deputy before the king in the comedy Z chłopą król by Piotr Baryka (1637), or the "Song of the Cossack and Kulyna" in the Lenten morality play Mięsopust albo tragikomedia by an anonymous author (1622). This author, without quoting the full text of the song, merely indicated that Łapikufel, the hero of the sketch, was to sing "Oj kozačenku." The first two words of the first line were apparently quite sufficient for this purpose, and this proves that the song must have been very popular and well-known at that time.²⁶

This reference is by no means an isolated example; there is ample evidence to indicate that Ukrainian folk songs were wide-spread and popular.

²⁴R.F. Kyrčiv, "Ukrajins'kyj fol'klor u staropols'kij literaturi," Slavistyčnyj zbirnyk (Kiev, 1963), p. 311.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 312 and 319.

²⁶Ibid., p. 319.

One of the earliest examples is a love poem, "Frasunek," by M. Sęp Szarzyński (1550-1581). The author began with a line in Ukrainian but with the remainder of the poem entirely in Polish.²⁷ The Ukrainian beginning, obviously, was to indicate the proper melody for singing this poem. The Ukrainian song itself, therefore, must have been very well-known at the time.

Another example attesting the popularity of Ukrainian folk songs was discovered by Bruckner in an unpublished manuscript of Adam Kopczyński (the second half of the seventeenth century).²⁸ In this poem, Wizerunek złocistej przyjaźnią zdrady, the hero, while serenading his sweetheart, states "A Ukrainian song merely by virtue of being in Ukrainian makes it more tender than in Polish." At another point in the poem, the author has his hero playing "Zaporozhian dumas in the Cossack fashion."²⁹

In the seventeenth century not only were numerous references to Ukrainian songs encountered, but in many cases the entire text of the song is given.³⁰ The earliest known example of this is the song "Pastusze,

²⁷A. Bruckner, "Sępa Szarzyńskiego wiersze nieznane", Biblioteka Warszawska, Vol. 3 (1891), pp. 531-552. These verses, of which the above-mentioned "Frasunek" is only one example, were discovered by Bruckner himself in 1891. His own investigations led him to consider them as works of Szarzyński. This position was later challenged by T. Sinko, "Problemy Sępowe", Studia staropolskie. Księga ku czci Aleksandra Brucknera (Cracow, 1928), pp. 457-465. Since then, however, Bruckner's position has been defended by B. Nadolski, "Ze studiów nad twórczością M. Sępa Szarzyńskiego", Pamiętnik Literacki, Zeszyt 1 (1930), pp. 1-25, and by G. Maver, "Rozważania nad poezją Mikołaja Sępa Szarzyńskiego", Pamiętnik Literacki, Zeszyt 2 (1957), pp. 308-344.

²⁸Bruckner, "Pieśni polsko-ruskie", Pamiętnik Literacki, Zeszyt II (1911), p. 195.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Kyrčiv, "Ukrajins'kyj fol'klor...", p. 325.

pastusze, lublu tie do dusze" which J.S. Herburt incorporated into his autobiographical poem Herkules z Fortuna i Cnota (1612).³¹ The author skillfully used this song of the careless shepherd as a motif in justifying his own rebellion against an ineffectual king. Another early example is the song "Pieśń o kozaku i Kulinie" which Jan Dzwonowski published along with some of his own writings in the pamphlet Sejmu walnego domowego artykułów sześć (1625).³² The song had no apparent connection with the other writings and was included solely because its popularity would help sell the pamphlet.

There are also numerous brochure publications containing nothing but the words to these songs, and this is certainly indicative of their general popularity. An interesting example of this type of "song-sheet" is the duma "O wojnie z kozakami," discovered by P. Žytec'kyj and A. Petrov in 1877 in the Benedictine library in Pułtusk. With the help of K.J.T. Estreicher's monumental Bibliografia polska, XV, p. 365, they were able to identify these two printed pages as a brochure originally published in 1651.³³ M. Voznjak's exhaustive study of this and other brochures brought to light over fifteen separate examples of this type of Ukrainian song-sheet, which have been preserved since the seventeenth century.³⁴ All of this merely proves that in the early seventeenth

³¹Ibid., p. 323.

³²Bruckner, "Pieśni polsko - ruskie," p. 190.

³³A. Petrow, P. Žiteckij, "Die Niederlage Bogdan Chmelnicki's bei Beresteczko am Flusse Styr 1651, in poetischer Bearbeitung," Archiv für slavische Philologie, II (1877), pp. 297-307.

³⁴M. Voznjak, Ukrajins'ki pisni v pol's'kyx vydannjax XVII st. (Lviv, 1937).

century, even at the height of the Cossack Wars, there was no apparent animosity toward the Ukrainian language as such, and that the average Pole, through these songs, had considerable opportunity to become familiar with Ukrainian words and phonetic patterns.

The favourable climate for Ukrainianisms continued into the eighteenth century. In the personal remarks to his translation of Félix Juvenal de Carleucas's Essai sur l'histoire des Sciences, des Belles-Lettres et des Arts,³⁵ Prince Adam K. Czartoryski wrote:

If the Italians and French were able to make their language richer through the acquisition of Greek and Latin words, why cannot the Poles [do the same] with words and methods of speaking taken from Ukrainian, from Slavonic [in the original - z słowieńskiego; possibly Church Slavonic?], from Czech, so long as they express the thing well and agree with the basis of the Polish language.³⁶

The prince, of course, did not use the term ukraiński, but ruski in accordance with the usage of that time. In the majority of such cases, it is apparent that the author in question is referring to Ukrainian. This is made clear either by the context or the use of some other term such as moskiewski or rosyjski for Russian. Unfortunately, there are no such indications in this work, but the facts of Czartoryski's biography make it highly improbable that he would recommend the use of Russian words. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that one of the East Slavic languages has taken precedence over Czech as a potential source of new words.

Stanisław Kleczewski, the first to cite concrete examples of

³⁵In the 1766 work Historia nauk wyzwolonych*

*"Czartoryski, Adam Kazimierz, Książę" Wielka Encyklopedia Powszechna PWN (1963), Vol. 2, p. 701.

³⁶Alicja Głowacka, Rozważania Księcia A.K. Czartoryskiego nad kształtowaniem się języka polskiego (Praca magisterska, Uniwersytet Warszawski, 1958), p. 28.

Ukrainian influence on the vocabulary of Polish, had some interesting views on Ukrainian loanwords in general:

And finally, it is permissible to draw some nourishment from our neighbors, i.e., Rus', Muscovy and Bohemia, for these above mentioned nations in the ancient manner make use of one Slavic language [although different from the Polish system]. And their words would agree more readily with the Polish language than Latin or French words which have no connection with it [i.e., the Polish language] ... Thus, rather than foreign words it is more fitting to adapt Ukrainian words to Polish... Some may find the Ukrainian language loathsome because it is the language of only coarse, uneducated people and is thereby less significant. It has been said, nevertheless, that we ought to search for elemental words among the common people and the unsophisticated... They know no inventions nor do they meddle with the sciences... and they could preserve the ancient words better.³⁷

Kleczewski's experience with Slavic languages certainly seems to have been rather limited, for he lumped Ukrainian, Russian, and Czech together as "one Slavic language." His knowledge of them, apparently, consisted solely of the fact that they were "different from the Polish system." The pertinent fact, however, is that in the middle of the eighteenth century there was still a favourable attitude toward the adoption of Ukrainian words into Polish. Furthermore, Kleczewski's reasons for suggesting this are interesting since they represent a peculiarly romantic notion long before romanticism appeared in Poland.

Also of great value and pertinence to this survey are the opinions and suggestions of the famous Polish statesman and educator, Hugo Kołłątaj (1750-1812). In his well-known work describing the state of education in Poland during the latter part of the reign of Zygmunt August (1733-1763),³⁸

³⁷S. Kleczewski, O początku, dawności, odmianach y wydoskonaleniu języka polskiego zdania (Lwów, 1767), p. 8.

³⁸H. Kołłątaj, Stan oświecenia w Polsce w ostatnich latach panowania Augusta III (1750-1764) z przedmową Henryka Mościckiego (Warsaw, 1905).

he included a chapter "The Manifold Dialects of the Polish language and the Separate Tongues in Many Provinces." Among the separate languages of the Empire, he gave first place, naturally enough, to Polish, which he termed "mowa słowiańskopolska."³⁹ He also listed the language of Samogitia ("mowa źmudzi"; possibly Lithuanian?), Latvian, and the language of Kurland and Livonia which he described as "created from German and Samogitian" [sic].⁴⁰

In discussing the "manifold dialects of the Polish language," Kołłątaj mentioned only the dialect spoken in the Ukraine and Belorussia, which he defined as "ruski", but one entirely different from the Muscovian dialect."⁴¹ He finished his discourse with the following suggestion:

The government should do everything possible to lessen the difference among the languages, to bring the many dialects closer together, and to stamp out the non-Slavic tongues.⁴²

Kołłątaj, therefore, felt that the Polish Empire would be stronger if it could rid itself of all non-Slavic languages; and, on the other hand, it should blend all the "Slavic dialects" or languages mentioned by Kołłątaj into one new language. Since the only Slavic dialects or languages mentioned by Kołłątaj are Polish, Ukrainian and Belorussian (the latter two he considered one dialect), he was actually advocating the merger of these three languages. Such suggestions may be quite impractical,

³⁹B. Skrzędliński, Hugo Kołłątaj, jako krzewiciel oświaty (Białystok, 1938), p. 14.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 15.

⁴²Ibid., p. 16.

but they at least demonstrate a favourable climate for the entry of Ukrainian words and phrases into Polish.

The attitude that Ukrainian is merely a dialect of Polish is still encountered as late as the 1850's in the works of T.T. Jeż, who referred to it as a "dialect of our language" (in the original - narzecze mowy naszej).⁴³ Jeż, however, is an anomaly, and in general it is true that by the nineteenth century there were no more exponents of borrowing from Ukrainian. This was so for three main reasons.

Firstly, former exponents of the use of Ukrainian words had all argued that this would aid the development of the Polish language. Yet by the nineteenth century Polish had developed sufficiently that this was no longer felt necessary. The orthography, grammar and vocabulary of Polish had been fairly well established by that time, thus making more difficult the adoption of new or foreign elements into the language. Secondly, the partitions (1772, 1793, 1795) cut off many of the great Polish families (the so-called kresowi of the eastern regions) from the main stream of Polish cultural life. Thus was closed one of the main postals for the entry of Ukrainianisms. Finally, throughout the nineteenth century, as Ukrainian developed as a modern literary language and as Slavic studies developed as a separate science, it became more and more difficult to maintain the fiction that Ukrainian was merely some sort of provincial Polish dialect.

⁴³W. Doroszewski, Język T.T. Jeża (Warsaw, 1949), p. 17.

In conclusion it can be stated that thanks to a favourable climate toward Ukrainianisms in former times (from the sixteenth to eighteen centuries), there was never any campaign conducted against them even though they were quite numerous. On the other hand, there was a great deal of ink shed in the struggle against Latinisms, Gallicisms, and later on against Russian and German influences.

Methodological Remarks

A. Methods of Proof

1. Testimony of recognized authorities.

In this study the testimony of authoritative scholars in the science of etymology will be considered the best and most convincing form of evidence as to whether any given lexeme is or is not a Ukrainianism. It will, therefore, be necessary to give a short survey of the etymological materials available in both Polish and Ukrainian and to evaluate them critically.

At the very outset, it must be stated that the etymological works in both languages are, regrettably, very far from adequate. Neither Polish nor Ukrainian possesses the reputable, comprehensive and universally recognized etymological dictionary like, for example, Vasmer's excellent work for the Russian language.¹ Polish, however, is much better off in this respect than Ukrainian. At present Ukrainian possesses only four small volumes of its first etymological dictionary.² This is certainly a step in the right direction, and these first volumes are all of high quality. Unfortunately, the complete work will not be available until about 1980.³

¹M. Vasmer, Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1953).

²J. Rudnyc'kyj, An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language (Winnipeg, 1962+), I-IV (1965)

³Ibid. Publisher's note, Vol. I; personal information supplied by the author.

This serious deficiency in Slavonic studies is felt by all those doing research in either language, and this applies equally to the present author; the situation is not intolerable, however, since only Polish references are necessary for indicating the origin of any given word in that language; and Polish is much better investigated etymologically than Ukrainian, as the following surveys will demonstrate.

(a) Polish Etymological Works

First of all one must mention Linde's monumental six volume work.⁴ Strictly speaking, it is not an etymological dictionary, but an invaluable source of information as it dates the earliest attestation and names the first user of any given word. If one happens upon a word which appears to be a Ukrainianism, the investigator can easily check the biography of the first user(s) in any Polish encyclopedia or textbook on Polish literary history⁵ to ascertain whether he had lived in an area where he would have been subjected to Ukrainian linguistic influences. If this is the case, then the word is probably a Ukrainianism. Linde, of course, is now dated, but this general shortcoming has little application to this study since the period of extensive borrowing from Ukrainian ended by 1807. A more up-to-date work is the so-called Słownik Warszawski,⁶ modelled on Linde and containing the same kind of information; thus, it will be dealt with in the same way as Linde.

⁴S.B. Linde, Słownik języka polskiego (Warsaw, 1807-1814; 2nd ed. Lwów, 1854-1860; photo-offset reprinting of 2nd ed., Warsaw, 1951).

⁵S. Hrabec, F. Pepłowski, Wiadomości o autorach i dziełach cytowanych w Słowniku Lindego (Warsaw, 1963).

⁶J. Karłowicz, A. Kryński, W. Niedźwiecki, Słownik języka polskiego (Warsaw, 1900-1927).

The first real etymological work is Bruckner's dictionary.⁷ It, too, is out of date, but not for the purposes of this study. Its major weakness consists in its rather loose application of the term ruski, under which Bruckner lumps together not only any troublesome East-Slavic borrowing of vague origin, but many other words which are clearly Ukrainian. In Bruckner's day Polish Slavacists used the term małoruski when referring to anything Ukrainian and ruski only in regard to common East Slavic phenomena.⁸ Hence this confusion in Bruckner is inexcusable. A chauvinist to some degree, he was reluctant to admit Polish borrowings from those on a "lower cultural level."⁹

Sławski's comprehensive and accurate etymological dictionary, which began appearing in 1952, is by far the best work of its kind to appear in Polish.¹⁰ Sławski is more careful when dealing with East Slavic borrowings, since he identifies them carefully as either Russian, Belorussian, or Ukrainian, and uses the term ruski only when precise identification of an East Slavic word is extremely difficult. He has not yet managed

⁷Bruckner, Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego (Cracow, 1927; 2nd ed. Warsaw, 1957).

⁸T. Lehr-Spławiński, Studia i szkice wybrane (Warsaw, 1957), pp. 257-294, 304-314, 339-398.

⁹Bruckner expresses this view in "Cywilizacja i język. Szkice z dziejów kultury polskiej," Biblioteka Warszawska, Vol. II (Warsaw, 1899), pp. 393, and "Wpływy języków obcych na język polski. Wpływy ruskie," Encyklopedia polska (Cracow, 1915) II, Sec. 3, part I, ch. 9, pp. 140-141. For reference to his anti-Ukrainian feelings see J. Rozwadowski, "Recenzja z wydania 'Dziejów języka polskiego' Brucknera," Język Polski, XIV (1914), p. 92, and K. Nitsch, "Wspomnienia," Język Polski, LIX (1951), p. 359.

¹⁰F. Sławski, Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego (Cracow, 1952), I-II, Fascicle 3 (8).

to finish his great work (the last volume extends only to kokornak (October, 1963)).

In Warsaw in 1954 a group of Polish scholars published a dictionary of foreign terms.¹¹ This work, like Sławski's, distinguishes Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian loanwords and makes no use of any such term as ruski under which all East-Slavic borrowings could be listed. The work is accurate and current, but it is meant to be a practical handbook for the modern reader and not a scholarly reference work. Therefore it includes a preponderance of newly imported words dealing with modern technology, science or sport. This automatically excludes many historically significant Ukrainianisms dating from the days of Imperial Poland and the Cossack Wars. Nevertheless, it still included many Ukrainianisms.

Moderately useful is the Słownik staropolski (Dictionary of Old-Polish) which is not a dictionary in the usual English sense of the word.¹² It is more in the nature of an encyclopedia describing the customs, institutions, costumes, weapons, tools, and culture of medieval Poland. If some particular item was imported from the Ukrainian region of the Polish Empire, then this encyclopedic dictionary can provide helpful evidence in proving that the name of the article in question is a Ukrainian loanword.

¹¹Z. Rysiewicz, ed., Słownik wyrazów obcych (Warsaw, 1954; 2nd ed., 1961).

¹²K. Nitsch, Z. Klemensiewicz, S. Urbańczyk, eds., Słownik staropolski (Warsaw, 1953).

Lastly, one can mention certain special monographs dealing with the language of those Poles (writers, civil servant and others) who came from the southeastern regions of pre-partition Poland. They are known in Polish as the kresowi (from the Polish kres: border, edge), and their works contain large numbers of Ukrainianisms. Through the writings of the kresowi the vast majority of Ukrainian loanwords entered literary Polish. Of particular interest here are the studies undertaken by such scholars as S. Hrabec¹³ and A. Martel.¹⁴ The former deals with this regional form of the language as used in literature, while the latter also examines the administrative language (preserved in official documents and court records) and the colloquial speech (preserved in personal letters, diaries, etc.). More specialized are the studies of the language of individual authors such as Doroszewski's study of the language of T.T. Jeź.¹⁵

(b) Ukrainian Etymological Works

While Polish etymological works will be used to demonstrate that certain competent Polish scholars definitely regard some given lexeme as a Ukrainian loanword, Ukrainian works will be employed in a different way. They will be used mainly to demonstrate, whenever possible, that the

¹³S. Hrabec, Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy XVI i XVII w. (Toruń, 1949).

¹⁴A. Martel, La langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes; Ukraine et Russie Blanche, 1569-1667 (Lille, 1938).

¹⁵W. Doroszewski, Język T.T. Jeża (Warsaw, 1949).

lexeme in question has an earlier attestation in Ukrainian sources than in Polish. This information is extremely valuable when dealing with words of Turkic origin which entered Polish through Ukrainian. Unfortunately, works supplying this type of historical data are, like almost all types of etymological references, extremely rare in Ukrainian.

First of all there is Tymčenko's historic dictionary of the Ukrainian language¹⁶ which was never completed because of the purge of the Ukrainian Academy of Science in 1930-1932.¹⁷ Only one volume (A-Ž) ever appeared, and even this is a bibliographic rarity. Fortunately, there is good reason to believe that Tymčenko's card-index has miraculously survived both the Great Soviet Purge and the Second World War, for periodically some mention or reference to it appears in an article published in the Soviet Ukraine.¹⁸

Recently a whole series of articles and short works have appeared which deal with some specific aspect of Ukrainian vocabulary from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century.¹⁹ These studies are mainly

¹⁶Je. Tymčenko, Istoryčnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koho jazyka, I (Kharkiv-Kiev, 1930-1932). For a full description of this work see Mytropolyt Ilarion [I. Ohijenko], Istoriya ukrajin'koji literaturnoji movy (Winnipeg, 1950), pp. 344-349.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 349. See also H. Kostiuik, Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine (New York, 1960), pp. 57 and 62.

¹⁸Two such articles were U. Je. Jedlins'ka, "Do pytannja pro vzajemodiju knyžnyx i narodnyx elementiv v ukrajins'kij movi XVII st." Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy, IV (1962), pp. 52-65, and D.H. Hrynčyšyr, "Iz sposterežen' nad administratyvno-jurydyčnoju leksykoju v ukrajins'kyx hramotax XIV-XV st." Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy, V (1962), pp. 39 and 51.

¹⁹L.L. Humec'ka, Narys slovotvorčoji systemy ukrajins'koji aktovoji movy XIV-XV st. (Kiev, 1958), and M.L. Xudaš, Leksyka ukrajins'kyx dilovyx dokumentiv kincja XVI - počatku XVII st. (Kiev, 1961). See also the following articles from Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy:

valuable because they occasionally provide evidence for an earlier attestation in Ukrainian than in any Polish source. The material in these articles is, unfortunately, scattered and meagre, but it is gratifying to note that the last four articles are based on the card-index for a new Ukrainian historical dictionary. One can only hope that it will make its appearance soon; it is sorely needed.

Similar information (i.e., regarding source and earliest attestation) can be gleaned from Sreznevskij.²⁰ Only the investigator must make sure that the source quoted in Sreznevskij can truly be considered a Ukrainian document. This can be done easily enough by limiting oneself strictly to those documents regarded as source material by competent historians of the Ukrainian language such as Hruns'kyj and Koval'ov, Bevzenko, or Bezpal'ko et al.²¹

Hrynčyšyn, "Iz sposterežen'...", V (1962), pp. 31-51, and "Imennykova synonimika v ukrajins'kyx pamjatkax XIV-XV st.," VI (1964), pp. 60-80; U. Je. Jedlins'ka, "Do pytannja pro vzajemodiju knyžnyx i narodnyx elementiv v ukrajins'kij movi XVII st.," IV (1961), pp. 52-65; M.M. Onyškevyč, "Spostereženja nad frazeolohijeju tvoriv T. Vyšens'koho," IV (1961) pp. 126-132; L.M. Poljuha, "Iz sposterežen' nad abstraktnoju leksykoju ukrajins'koji aktovoju movy XIV-XV st.," VI (1964), pp. 109-120; and U.L. Xudaš, "Landšaftni nazvy v pamjatkax ukrajins'koji aktovoju movy XIV-XV st.," V (1962), pp. 143-157, and "Vyrobnyčo-profesijna ta administratyvno-jurydyčna leksyka ukrajins'kyx dilovyx dokumentiv kincja XVI-počatku XVII st.," II (1960), pp. 86-123.

²⁰I.I. Sreznevskij, Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka (St. Petersburg, 1890-1912; 2 nd ed. Graz 1955; 3 rd ed. Moscow, 1958).

²¹M.K. Hruns'kyj, P.K. Koval'ov, Narysy z istoriji ukrains'koji movy (L'viv, 1941), pp. 12-19; S.P. Bevzenko, Istoryčna morfolohija ukrajins'koji movy (Užhorod, 1960), pp. 407-411; and O.P. Bezpal'ko, M.K. Bojčuk, M.A. Žovtobryx, S.P. Samijlenko, Istoryčna hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy (Kiev, 1962), pp. 53-62, hereafter cited as Bezpal'ko.

P. Kovaliv's study of the lexical fund of the literary language of the Kievan Principality (tenth to fourteenth centuries) also provides much historical data.²² Strictly speaking, Kovaliv is not dealing with Old Ukrainian but with Old Rus', a language which is the common heritage of all East Slavic nationalities;²³ therefore, he could not include material beyond the fourteenth century. This is unfortunate because it automatically excludes the vast quantities of Turkic words which entered Ukrainian in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, many of which later also found their way into Polish.

2. Evidence of Chronology

In Galicia certain Ukrainian lexical elements begin appearing sporadically in Polish sources as early as the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, but by the middle of the sixteenth century they suddenly become quite numerous.²⁴ In fact, Prof. Hrabec was able to identify over eighty Ukrainianisms in the works of Mikołaj Rej (1505-1569) who was, after all, born and raised in Ukrainian ethnic territory (in Żórawna near Halicz).²⁵ More surprising and significant, therefore, is the large number of Ukrainianisms in Marcin Bielski (1495-1575) who had only superficial contacts with those from the eastern border area (i.e.,

²²P. Kovaliv, Leksyčnyj fond literaturnoji movy kyjivs'koho periodu X-XIV st., (New York, Vol. I, 1962, Vol. II, 1964).

²³Ibid., xii, xiii-ix.

²⁴P.P. Pljušč, Narysy z ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy (Kiev, 1958), p. 172.

²⁵S. Hrabec, Elementy kresowe..., p. 46-47, and T. Lehr-Spławiński, Język polski; pochodzenie, powstanie, rozwój (Warsaw, 1951), p. 278.

the so-called Kresy).²⁶ Ukrainian influence, however, becomes intensive only after the Union of Lublin in 1569, when the Ukraine came under Polish administration.²⁷ Only after this date did large numbers of Polish landlords, clerics, military people of all ranks, governmental agents and administrative officials come into direct personal contact with Ukrainians and Ukrainian linguistic influence, and not long afterwards these direct contacts were being intensified by warfare.²⁸

Mutual Polish-Ukrainian influence has continued in varying degrees of intensity right up to the present day, but the high-water mark of intensive Ukrainian influence was reached in the middle and latter half of the seventeenth century.²⁹ A brief revival of Ukrainian influence at the beginning of the nineteenth century occurred among Polish writers of the so-called "Ukrainian School" who were fond of coloring their works with various Ukrainianisms.³⁰

At this point one must emphasize that the historical outline given above applies exclusively to loanwords and not to the whole field of

²⁶ P.P. Pljušč, Narysy..., p. 173, and T. Lehr-Spławiński, P. Zwoliński, S. Hrabec, Dzieje języka ukraińskiego w zarysie (Warsaw, 1956), p. 35.

²⁷ Pljušč, Narysy..., pp. 172-175.

²⁸ The Ukrainian historian, D. Dorošenko, reports a total of twenty-five armed conflicts between Polish and Ukrainian forces within a period of 203 years (1569-1772). See D. Dorošenko, History of the Ukraine (Edmonton, 1939), pp. 146, 173-178, 207, 211, 217-220, 233-247, 251-277, 294, 301-303, 310-312, 317, 378-380, 401, and 513-515. One should keep in mind that within the same period, the Cossacks often fought as mercenary allies of Poland in her wars against Turkey, Moldavia, Sweden, Muscovy and against the Tatars; see ibid., pp. 184-185, 191, 199, 209, 216-217, 290.

²⁹ T. Lehr-Spławiński, Język polski..., pp. 277-278; Pljušč, Narysy..., p. 172.

³⁰ Ibid.

Polish-Ukrainian linguistic relationships. Y. Šerech, in his investigation of this problem, advances many convincing arguments which indicate an extensive interaction of Polish and Ukrainian dialects from the tenth to the fourteenth century.³¹ This mutual influence, however, manifests itself not so much in lexical borrowings, but more in the form of phonetic contaminations. For example, from the proto-Slavic forms *edynъjъ and *červenъjъ, we would expect to find *jedziny and *czerwiony in Polish, but *odynnyj and *čorvenyj in Ukrainian. What we actually find is jedyny and czerwony in Polish but jedynyj and červonyj in Ukrainian. "The new forms in both languages are most easily explained as contaminations of the phonetically regular Polish and Ukrainian forms."³² Such "irregularities," and Šerech cites many examples, are explainable only when one assumes an extensive overlapping and interplay of both languages at an early period of their formation.³³ Yet for the same period examples of true loanwords are quite rare. Hens'ors'kyj, in his detailed analysis of the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle (1201-1292), could find only six loanwords and seventeen calques taken directly from Polish.³⁴ Therefore, one can state that any Ukrainian borrowing should first appear in writings around 1550-1700 or 1800-1830.

³¹Šerech-Shevelov, "The Problem...", Word, VIII, No. 4, (December, 1952), pp. 327-249.

³²Ibid., p. 340.

³³The same opinion is shared by Lehr-Spławiński, Język polski..., pp. 68-70.

³⁴A.I. Hens'ors'kyj, Halyc'ko - volyns'kyj litopys (Kiev, 1961), pp. 99-101 and 139-140.

3. Evidence of Meaning

The borrowings from Ukrainian into Polish are those which come about through close everyday contact by hearing the speech of soldiers and prisoners, household servants, and serfs, by haggling in the market place, or through an imperfect knowledge of Polish on the part of the Polonized Ukrainian nobility who often added new words from their mother tongue.³⁵ In other words, Ukrainian influence was always direct and informal.³⁶ The range of borrowings from Ukrainian is confined to the names of such common items as foods, plants, topographical features, place-names, clothing, terms of horsemanship, or the names of ranks, titles, insignia, and weapons of the Cossacks. The borrowings often have a definite Ukrainian coloration.

4. Evidence of Source

A Ukrainianism is likely to appear first only in the writings of persons who had an opportunity of direct contact with Ukrainian speakers. This is in sharp contrast to Czechisms which may appear in the writings of a person from any region of Poland, that is, in the writings of any Pole who had access to Czech manuscripts or books which were very popular and widespread in Poland throughout the fifteenth and the first half of the sixteenth centuries.³⁷

³⁵ Lehr-Spławiński, Język polski..., pp. 278, 296-298.

³⁶ Z. Stieber, "Rol' otidel'nykh dialektov v formirovanii polskogo literaturnogo jazyka," Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 3 (May-June, 1964), pp. 42-43.

³⁷ Lehr-Spławiński, Język polski..., pp. 271-272; Lehr-Spławiński, K. Piwarski, Z. Wojciechowski, Polska-Czechy. Dziesięć wieków sąsiedztwa (Katowice-Wrocław, 1949), pp. 108-121.

5. Evidence of Phonology

The phonological facts can be organized into three groups having varying degrees of usefulness. It must be emphasized that each group contains only those features which help to identify a Ukrainianism in Polish.

A. Ukrainian features shared with the other East Slavic languages.³⁸

Each Ukrainian feature is contrasted with its corresponding development in Polish. The final column contains the original, that is, the proto-Slavic form.

Ukrainian	Polish	Proto-Slavic
1. o (in initial position) ozero	je jeziro	*e *ezero
2. 'a vjazatysja	'e, 'o wiązać się	*e *vezati se
3. u mudryj	e, o mądry	*o mōdrъjъ
4. ž meža	dz miedza	*dj *medja
5. č plaču nič	c place noc	*tj, *kt' *platjō *noktō
6. l vely plely	dl, tl wiedli pletli	*dl, *tl *vedli *pletli

³⁸See Bezpāl'ko, pp. 23-27, and T. Bajmut, K. Bojčuk, M. Volyns'kyj, M. Žovtobryjux, T. Malyna, S. Samijlenko, Porivnjal'na hramatyka ukrajins'koji i rosijs'koji mov (Kiev, 1957), pp. 51-60.

7. epenthetic "l" in all positions	epenthetic "l" only within a morpheme	labial consonant + j
zemlja pljuju	ziemia pluje	*zemja *pjujq
8. tolot holova moloko	tlot, tlet glowa mleko	*tol't, *tel't *gol'va mel'ko
9. torot, teret boroda berek	trot, tr'et broda brzeg	*tort, *tert *borda *bergʷ
10. The second and third palatalizations:		
(a)s' musi	s musze	x + ě ₂ (<ai) *muxě ₂
(b)z' (dz') dorozi knjaz'	dz drodze ksiadz (<kniadz)	g + ě ₂ , e ₂ *dorgě ₂ *kʷnēgʷ
(c)cv, zv (second palatalization) cvit zvizda (dial.)	kv, gv kwiat gwiazda	*kv, gv + ě ₂ (<ai) *květʷ *gvězda
11. The vocalization of <u>jer</u> :		
(a)o son	e sen	* sʲnʲ
(b)tovt (<tʲlt) tovstyj vovk	tlut, tolt telt, t'ilt tlusty wilk	*tlʲt, *tlʲ't *tlʲstʲjʲ *vlʲ'kʲ
(c)tort, tert (<tʲrt, tʲrt) horlo verx	t'ert, ter't gardlo wierzch	*trʲt, *trʲ't grʲdlo vrʲ'xʲ

Regarding the dating of these phenomena, all features except feature 11 are well established in the earliest East Slavic documents, i.e., they took place before the eleventh century.³⁹ Feature 11(a) was completed

³⁹L. Jakubinskij, Istorija drevnerusskogo jazyka (Moscow, 1953), pp. 99-103, 122-130, and 134-138.

during the second half of the twelfth century.⁴⁰ Features 11(b) and (c) reached their completion later, around the end of the thirteenth century.⁴¹

B. Ukrainian features shared only with Belorussian.⁴²

The Roman numerals in brackets indicate the century(ies) in which each particular feature appeared. The first numeral indicates the date of its earliest appearance, the second--the date of its completion. For greater accuracy the following abbreviations are also used: b. end. All dates are cited from Bezpál'ko et al.⁴³

Ukrainian	Polish	Proto-Slavic
1. h (XII-XIII) hora	g gora	*g *gora
2. Vocalization of l in closed syllables (orthographically v, phonetically u):		
(a) v < l, l' (XV) tovstyj movcati	ż, l tżusty milczec	*l, *l' *tlstʒjɐ *ml'ceti
(b) past tense of verbs (XV) pysav	ż pisaż	*-l *pisałɐ

In the literary language this phenomenon (as a predictable feature) is limited to the two positions defined above, although it is much more

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 143.

⁴¹T.G. Vinokur, Drevnerusskij jazyk (Moscow, 1961), p. 65.

⁴²T. Bajmut, et al., Porivnjal'na hramatyka..., pp. 64-65.

⁴³Bezpál'ko, pp. 87, 168-169, and p. 129.

extensive in some dialects.⁴⁴

3.	tryt (e. XIII-e. XVI) kryvavyj tryvoha	trt krwawy trwoga	*trɛt, *trɛt *krɛvavɛjɛ *trɛvoga
4.	tlyt (e. XIII-e. XVI) jablyko (dial.)	tlɫ jabłko	*tlɛt, *tlɛt *(j) ablɛko

Regarding the last two features, it must be pointed out that Ukrainian often shows deviations while Belorussian is more regular.⁴⁵ This can be a useful criterion for distinguishing Ukrainian and Belorussian borrowings in Polish.

C. Ukrainian features not shared with the other East Slavic languages.⁴⁶

In the column of Ukrainian features, the symbols to the left of the figure (>) represent Old East Slavic phonemes, those to the right--modern Ukrainian phonemes. The system for indicating the date of each phenomenon is the same as that described above and, together with other details, are again taken from Bezpál'ko et al.⁴⁷ Only feature 6 is based on other sources.⁴⁸

⁴⁴M.K. Hruns'kyj, P.K. Koval'ov, Narysy..., pp. 90-91.

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 44-45. See Bezpál'ko, pp. 168-169, P.F. Hlebka, ed., Narysy pa historyi belaruskaj movy (Minsk, 1957), p. 60, and T. Bajmut, et al., Porivnjal'na hramatyka..., pp. 61-66.

⁴⁶Bezpál'ko, pp. 31-35.

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 160-162, 149-151, 153-154, 154-155, 144-147, and 170.

⁴⁸V.V. Ivanov, Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moscow, 1964), pp. 211-221. P.F. Hlebka, ed., Narysy..., pp. 67-77.

Ukrainian	Polish
1. i, y > y (XI-b. XIV) syla, syn	i, y retained as separate phomenes siła, syn
2. ě > i (XI-b. XIV) misto, xlib	'a, 'e miasto, chleb
3. o, e > i in closed syllables rik, stil, mid'	o, o, 'e rok, stol, miedź

This phonological change, which was long and complicated, needs more detailed analysis. Even to this day it has not reached its completion in all Ukrainian dialects.

- (a) toṭ, toṭ > tōt > ūō > ūē > ū̇ > ū̇i (XIII-XIV) > i (XV-m.XVIII)
teṭ > tēt > iē > i̇ō > i̇ö > i̇ē > i̇i (XIII-XIV) > i (XV-m.XVIII)

The monophthong i in fifteenth-century documents is still extremely rare and limited to southern dialects. In Ukrainian borrowings in Polish in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries etymological e and o in the above defined positions are rendered by u not i.

- (b) teṭ > tēt' > iē > i̇ē > i̇ē > i (b.XIV)

4. j, š, č, ž + et > j, š, č, ž + ot žona, namet	t'e + t, d, s, z, n, ž, r > t'o + t, d, s, z, n, ž, r žona, namiot
5. 'e > e (XIII-b. XV) neseš, teplyj	'e > 'e niesiesz, ciepły

6. Absence of vowel reduction (akanie and jakanie) in both Ukrainian and Polish.

(a) Akanie first appeared in Rjazanskiy, Novgorod-Severskyj and Cernihivskyj regions (XII-XIII). This was the so-called Obojansk or archaic type of akanie.

(b) It then spread northward to the Moscow area (XIV-XV).

(c) Later it spread to Belorussian territory (XV-XVI).

Any feature in groups A or B is only moderately helpful; it must

always be supported with some other form of evidence (as described above). On the other hand, any feature in group C (except feature 6) requires no supporting evidence at all. Feature 6 of C, like all those of A and B, is helpful only when used with additional criteria. It follows, therefore, that features 1 to 5 of C are evidence of the highest order and any word containing one of them is automatically a Ukrainianism. It is a pity that such reliable criteria are limited in number and, therefore, can only occur in a limited number of the borrowings dealt with.

At this point, however, it must be emphasized that features 2 and 3 attained complete ikavism only in the southwestern dialects of Ukrainian. In northern and southeastern dialects ikavism did not generally take place with e in syllables closed by a hard consonant except with verbs in the masculine singular form of the past tense where etymological e consistently undergoes change.⁴⁹ In northern dialects ikavism is also dependent upon accent, that is, ě and o, e in newly closed syllables change to i only when accented.⁵⁰ In unaccented position o and e remain unchanged, and ě appears mostly as e. In the extreme northern dialects, ě and o, e even when accented still appears as diphthongs, and there are, on the other hand, many transitional dialects where monophthongization has been attained, but the resultant vowel is not i.⁵¹ The exact articulation

⁴⁹F.T. Žylko, Narysy z dialektolohiji ukrajins'koji movy (Kiev, 1955), pp. 66-67, 92, 158-159.

⁵⁰W. Kuraszkiewicz, Zarys dialektologii wschodniosłowiańskiej (Warsaw, 1963), p. 68.

⁵¹Žylko, Narysy z dialektolohiji..., pp. 66-68.

and geographical distribution of these diphthongs and monophthongs (<ě, o, e) are very complicated problems far beyond the scope of this work.⁵² Nevertheless, two paramount facts emerge. Monophthongization to i is a newer phenomenon,⁵³ and the dialects characterized by diphthongs at one time extended much further south.⁵⁴

These dialectal features are well reflected in the writings of those who originated from the above mentioned regions (for example, in Berynda, Smotryc'kyj, and in the interludes of Gawatowicz).⁵⁵

As stated previously, etymological o in any closed syllable in fifteenth to eighteenth century documents was rendered by u (indicating such diphthongs as ui, ue, uy, etc.);⁵⁶ etymological e in a syllable closed by a hard consonant was rendered by ju (also indicating a

⁵²Recent investigations of this problem has revealed ten monophthongs (other than i) and seven diphthongs as reflexes of iat', and four monophthongs (other than i) and eleven diphthongs as reflexes of o in newly closed syllables. See P.J. Prystupa, "Refleksy давн'oho nahološenocho ě na terytoriji zaxidnyx hovoriv ukrajins'koji movy," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy, IV (1961), pp. 145-154, and "Refleksy давн'oho nahološenocho o v novyx zakrytyx skladax na terytoriji zaxidnyx hororiv ukrajins'koji movy," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy, V (1962), pp. 135-142.

⁵³P.J. Prystupa, "Refleksy давн'oho nahološenocho ě...", p. 147; "Refleksy давн'oho nahološenocho o...", p. 141; and Žylko, Narysy z dialektolohiji..., p. 68.

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 158, 159, 165. F.P. Medvedjev, Narysy z ukrajins'koji istoryčnoji hramatyky (Kharkiv, 1964), p. 63.

⁵⁵See W. Witkowski, Fonetyka leksykonu Pamby Beryndy (Cracow, 1964), pp. 15-18, and 19-21; O. Horbatsch, Die vier Ausgaben der kirchenslavischen Grammatik von M. Smotryc'kyj (Wiesbaden, 1964), p. 8, and Je M. Markovs'kyj, "Do xarakterystyky movy ukrajins'kyx intermedij XVII - XVIII stolit'," Pytannja istoryčnoho rozvytku ukrajins'koji movy (Kharkiv, 1962), pp. 100-101.

⁵⁶F.P. Medvedjev, Narysy..., pp. 83-88.

labialized diphthong but more fronted).⁵⁷ This was a common feature of all Ukrainian dialects of that period; it was, however, limited to accented positions in northern dialects.

Etymological ě and e in a syllable closed by a soft consonant were both generally rendered with jat'.⁵⁸ In documents of southern origin, however, the confusion of jat' with i is a constant feature;⁵⁹ this indicates that jat' was merely a grapheme with the same phonetic value as i. On the other hand, documents of northern origin are quite consistent in their use of jat', at least in an accented position; this indicates that this grapheme still represented a distinct phonetic entity.⁶⁰ The fact that Ukrainian documents of that period also rendered Polish ě (the so-called e pochylone) as jat',⁶¹ and the data of modern northern Ukrainian dialects allow us to assume that jat' represented a diphthong of the type iě.⁶²

Therefore, the presence of a front diphthong (<ě or e in a syllable closed by a soft consonant) instead of ikavism in a loanword by no means disqualifies it as a Ukrainianism. It may simply mean that the word in question entered Polish from one of the northern Ukrainian dialectal areas

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 88-90.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 63.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Z. Stieber, Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego (Warsaw, 1958), p. 29.

⁶²Medvedjev, Narysy..., p. 64.

(including such centres as Černihiv, Luc'ke and Kiev itself).

B. Methods of Distinguishing Ukrainianisms from Other East Slavic Borrowings

For this purpose one can use the same five methods of proof already described, (testimony of authorities, evidence of chronology, meaning, source, and phonology). In addition to these there are three other criteria not mentioned before but helpful in solving this problem: the evidence of linguistic geography; the evidence of history; and the evidence of exclusiveness.

First, of the three Eastern Slavic languages, Polish is contiguous with only two of them--Ukrainian and Belorussian. The area of Polish-Belorussian ethnic contact is extremely small in comparison to that of contact with Ukrainian. With the exception of the Wilno region, the Polish-Belorussian ethnic boundary runs through a marshy, thinly-populated area where mutual borrowings were not likely to take place. It was only in Wilno that Polish writers could pick up a few Belorussian words (evidence of source), while contacts with Ukrainian could take place over a vast area. It follows, therefore, that there will be more borrowings from Ukrainian than from Belorussian. Second, Polish-Ukrainian contacts began as early as 1349 with the Polish annexation of Galicia,⁶³ but, as mentioned above, contacts on a massive scale began only after the Union of Lublin. Polish-Belorussian linguistic contacts can also be said to date from the same time, but because of the nature of the Belorussian terrain (except around Wilno) there were fewer of the great estates,

⁶³F. Dvornik, The Slavs in European History and Civilization (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1962), p. 215.

trading centres, or garrisons that characterized the Ukraine.⁶⁴ In other words, there was always far more opportunity for Polish to borrow from Ukrainian than from Belorussian.

Opportunities for borrowing from Russian began at a much later date than from the other two Eastern Slavic languages. With the exception of the occasional war,⁶⁵ there were few direct Polish-Russian contacts until, as a result of the second and third partitions of Poland (1793, 1795), Russia began governing territory ethnically Polish.

Third, this means that in some cases the word in question does not exist in Russian or Belorussian, but is exclusively Ukrainian and Polish. It is then a matter of proving an earlier attestation or identifying some phonetic features, etc., which could prove the direction of borrowing. The weakness of this method is that a given word may not be registered in the best dictionaries of the literary languages of Russian or Belorussian, but it may exist dialectally, and dialectal lexicology in both Belorussian and Russian is weakly developed. Even literary Belorussian is poorly investigated, although Russian already possesses several authoritative dictionaries.⁶⁶

⁶⁴Lehr-Spławski, "Wzajemne wpływy polsko-ruskie w dziedzinie językowej," Szkice z dziejów rozwoju i kultury polskiej (Lwów, 1938), pp. 108-115.

⁶⁵O. Halecki, A History of Poland (London, 1955), pp. 108, 135, 146-147, 157-163. Until 1569 Poland only occasionally sent token forces to aid her ally, Lithuania (linked only by a personal union of royal houses since 1386) in its quarrels with Muscovy, and even after that date many of the troops involved were not Polish. See T. Manteuffel, Historia Polski (Warsaw, 1958), Vol. I, part II, p. 198, and D. Dorošenko, History of the Ukraine, pp. 184-185.

⁶⁶For Belorussian see K.K. Krapiva, ed., Belorussko-russki slovar', (Moscow, 1962). The most comprehensive Russian dictionaries are Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950),

C. Criteria for Establishing Ukrainian as the Intermediary in Borrowings from Other Languages

Since Ukrainian ethnic territory separates Polish from Rumanian and the great Turko-Tataric language family, it is quite logical to suppose that, whenever both Polish and Ukrainian possess a word from either of these two sources, Ukrainian acted as the "middleman." Such an assumption is quite reasonable, and this is probably how the vast majority of Rumanian and Turko-Tataric loanwords entered Polish.⁶⁷ This supposition, however, is safe only when one deals with the earlier Turkic borrowings appearing in Polish in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries (evidence of time).⁶⁸

Rumanian terms may have been carried into Polish ethnic territory by Rumanian shepherds who ranged far into the Carpathian and Tatra Mountains.⁶⁹ Turkic words could have passed from the original languages directly into Polish when the Poles came into contact with these people in the middle of the seventeenth century.⁷⁰ It is true that Poland never bordered on any area which was ethnically Turkic, but she did share

Vols. I - XVI (complete to "F" in 1965), and Slovar' russkogo jazyka (Moscow, 1957-1961), Vols. I - IV.

⁶⁷A. Zajączkowski, Studia orientalistyczne z dziejów słownictwa polskiego (Wrocław, 1953), p. 32.

⁶⁸Lehr-Splawiński, Język polski..., p. 282.

⁶⁹Ibid.

⁷⁰Ibid.

a frontier with the Ottoman Empire, and warfare between these states was not uncommon.⁷¹ Poland also used to recruit mercenaries from among the Crimean Tatars, or just as often met them on the field of battle whenever the Cossacks hired them for the same purpose.⁷² Poland also carried on diplomatic relations, trade, and political intrigues with the Moldavian Hospodars, who were vassals of Poland as early as 1387.⁷³ Direct contacts with this ethnic group is a historical fact; and, therefore, independent borrowings are entirely possible.⁷⁴

The only definite proof of Ukrainian intermediacy is some phonetic reshaping--a reshaping explicable only in the light of Ukrainian phonology. If the word then reappears in Polish with the same reshaping, it was definitely borrowed from Ukrainian. An example here is the sound ğ, so common in Turkic languages; in independent borrowings Ukrainian accepted it as h, but Polish changed it to g. Therefore, when a Turko-Tataric word original containing ğ appears in Polish with h, we know that it has passed through Ukrainian.

Another criterion is that of earliest attestation; useful here are Kovaliv and Sreznevskij on the Ukrainian side, and Linde on the Polish.

⁷¹Poland shared a common frontier with the Ottoman Empire from 1484 to 1772, but the first full-scale war between them did not occur until 1520; the last war, fought mainly in Moldavia, lasted from 1683-1699. See O. Halecki, A History of Poland, pp. 100, 148, 172, 180.

⁷²D. Dorošenko, History of the Ukraine, pp. 245-246, 262.

⁷³T. Manteuffel, Historia Polski, p. 190.

⁷⁴P.P. Panaitescu, "Legăturile moldo-polono în secolul XV și problema chiliei," Romanoslavica, III (1958), 95-114.

Again this is only a helpful indication, not a definite form of proof since Polish may have borrowed the word independently, only at a later date.

Finally, one can always refer to the authorities in Polish etymology, Bruckner and Sławski, who provide much information on this vexing problem.

The Treatment of Ukrainian Phonemes in Polish

As a supplement to the phonological evidence already discussed, it is necessary to compare the phonemic systems of both Polish and Ukrainian. Such a comparison would allow us to determine how Polish speakers dealt with those phonemes which were foreign to their speech habits when they encountered them in Ukrainian borrowings. Once this has been established with recognized Ukrainian loanwords, the same principles can be used for proving the Ukrainian origin of words whose "pedigree" is still in doubt. It is necessary, therefore, to discover which sounds were phonemic in the phonological system of Ukrainian but foreign to that of Polish. The first step in this investigation will be to reconstruct the phonemic systems of the Polish and Ukrainian languages the early years of the seventeenth century; this will serve as a convenient focal point for the entire period of intense interaction between these two languages.

Z. Stieber has established that in the early sixteenth century Polish possessed the following phonemes:¹

i							
ë	e		o	ó			u
ę			ą				
a	â						
		p	p'	t			k
		b	b'	d			g
		f	f'	s	s'	ś	x
		v	v'	z	z'	ż	
				c	c'	ć	
				dz	dz'	dź	
		m	m'	n	n'		
				l	l'		
				r		ř	

It is evident from the above table that the phonemic structure of

¹Z. Stieber, Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego (Warsaw, 1958), pp. 36, 64.

sixteenth-century Polish differs very little from that of the modern literary language. This is especially true of the consonantal system where the only changes have been the elimination of ř (as a phoneme) and the addition of k' and g'. In the majority of Polish dialects, the phonemes ž and ř had already merged into one (ž) by the eighteenth century,² and "in all likelihood it is possible to speak of k' and g' as phonemes existing in the Polish language since the seventeenth century."³

The vowel system has undergone more extensive change since all of the so-called pochylone or narrowed vowels (ě, ô, â, ǣ) have been eliminated. By the early years of the seventeenth century the pronunciation of ǣ had narrowed and moved farther back to become o,⁴ and the phoneme ě had merged with either i or e depending on the dialectal distribution.⁵ The phonemes â and ô, on the other hand, proved to be rather more tenacious although their position in the phonemic system began to weaken as early as the sixteenth century.⁶ The former (â) disappeared only in the eighteenth century when a and â finally merged into a;⁷ ô was not completely eliminated until the early part of the nineteenth

²Ibid., p. 69. Stieber, however, also informs us that ř or rž, rš remained in the kresowe dialects throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 41.

⁵Ibid., p. 42.

⁶Z. Klemensiewicz, T. Lehr-Spławiński, S. Urbańczyk, Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego (Warsaw, 1955), pp. 92 and 99.

⁷Ibid., p. 93.

century when it merged with u, giving one phoneme (u).⁸ The impetus for the elimination of both â and ô came from the southeastern regions where, because of Ukrainian influence, they disappeared from the speech of the kresowi Poles at a much earlier date (possibly in the first half of the seventeenth century).⁹

The first step in the reconstruction of the phonemic system of early seventeenth-century Ukrainian will be a comparison of the system of modern literary Ukrainian¹⁰ with that of Old East Slavic or Old Rus'¹¹ (known as drevnerusskij in Russian and davn'orus'ka mova in Ukrainian) as based on the earliest East Slavic documents of the eleventh century.

Old East Slavic
(eleventh century)

i		y		u
ě				
ь			ѣ	
e			o	
a				
p	t			k
b	d			g
	s	s'	š'	x
v	z	z'	ž'	
		č'	č'	
m	n	n'		
	l	l'		
	r	r'		
	j			

Modern Ukrainian
(twentieth century)

i		u	
	y		
e		o	
a			
p	t	t'	k
b	d	d'	g
f	s	s'	š' x
v	z	z'	ž' h
	c	c'	č'
	dz	dz'	dž'
m	n	n'	
	l	l'	
	r	(r')	
	j		

⁸Klemensiewicz et al., Gramatyka historyczna..., p. 99.

⁹Stiber, Rozwój fonologiczny..., pp. 42-43.

¹⁰C.E. Bidwell, Slavic Historical Phonology in Tabular Form (The Hague, 1963), p. 65. The author also lists k', g', x', and h' as phonemic in Ukrainian. I have omitted them as all research, however extensive and exhaustive on my part, has failed to reveal any minimal pairs that would establish their phonemic status.

¹¹T.G. Vinokur, Drevnerusskij jazyk (Moscow, 1961), pp. 57, and 60.

It is clear from the above that nine centuries of development have given modern Ukrainian a complexion quite different from that of its earliest ancestor, and with the help of historical philology, it is possible to establish what changes had already taken place by the early seventeenth century. By the end of the twelfth century the jers had either vocalized or disappeared in accordance with their strong or weak position.¹² By the beginning of the fourteenth century, if not somewhat earlier according to M.F. Nakonečnyj, i and y had merged to form y,¹³ but a secondary i was developing from etymological jat' (ě) and from the so-called new jat' (e in syllables closed with palatalized consonants).¹⁴ It is commonly accepted that both etymological jat' and the so-called jat' passed through various diphthongal states (iē, 'iē, iĕ, etc.) before monophthongization in the form of i was finally attained.¹⁵ In southern dialects these phonetic processes reached their conclusion at an earlier date (the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries), but the diphthongs proved much more tenacious in the northern dialectal regions which, by the way, extended farther south than at present.¹⁶ In

¹²O.P. Bezpal'ko, M.K. Bojčuk, M.A. Žovtrobrjux, S.P. Samijlenko, Istoryčna hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy (Kiev, 1962), pp. 125-126, hereafter cited simply as Bezpal'ko.

¹³Ibid., pp. 160-162, and M.F. Nakonečnyj, "Do vyvčennja procesu stanovlennja j rozvytku fonetyčnoji systemy ukrajins'koji movy," Pytannja istoryčnoho rozvytku ukrajins'koji movy (Kharkiv, 1962), p. 144, hereafter cited simply Nakonečnyj.

¹⁴Bezpal'ko, pp. 149-151, 154-155.

¹⁵See pp. 43-46.

¹⁶F.P. Medvedjev. Narysy z ukrajins'koji istoryčnoji hramatyky (Kharkiv, 1964), pp. 63, and 88-90.

northern dialects in the early seventeenth century the diphthong ie (or some similar variant thereof depending on the exact region) was still a phoneme as, indeed, it is to this day.¹⁷ Before proceeding to discuss other phonemic changes, it would be well to point out that the above-mentioned processes of diphthongization or monophthongization are applicable only when iat' or new iat' are in an accented position. In an unaccented position they merge with e.¹⁸ The development of secondary i from o in any closed syllable and from e in a syllable closed with a hard consonant had not yet reached its completion by the early seventeenth century.¹⁹ At that time, etymological o and e in the above defined positions occasionally appeared as i but more often as u (<o) or ju (<e);²⁰ this seems to indicate a type of diphthongal pronunciation (uy, ui, üy, üi) still preserved in various northern Ukrainian dialects.²¹ In fact, Pamvo Berynda's famous Church Slavonic dictionary of 1627 affords only one example of the o > i process. In all other cases etymological o in newly-closed syllable appears as u, and there are numerous examples of etymological e in the same position

¹⁷F.T. Žylko, "Pytannja fonolohičnoho aspektu v ukrajins'kij dialektolohiji," Dialektolohičnyj bjuleten', 7 (1961), pp. 3-17.

¹⁸-----, Narysy z dialektolohij ukrajins'koji movy (Kiev, 1955), pp. 66-67.

¹⁹Bezpal'ko, pp. 153-154.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Žylko, Narysy z dialektolohiji..., pp. 65-67.

appearing as ju.²² Complete monophthongization to i, which was the normal result in the vast majority of Ukrainian dialects, was not completed until the beginning of the eighteenth century.²³

Finally, it is necessary to mention the change in the articulation of both etymological e and secondary e (<ь). Before hard consonants, the articulation of this phoneme became lower and shifted farther back to such an extent that it lost the ability to palatalize a preceding consonant. Bezpal'ko dates this process as extending from the thirteenth to the beginning of the fifteenth century; Nakonečnyj, on the other hand, with much scholarly documentation and logic, makes a convincing case for the thirteenth century as the time of this process.²⁴ This change, although not altering the sum total of phonemes, considerably effected the phonological system in other respects.

Having examined those processes which effected the vocalic phonemes, we can now move on to a brief résumé of the developments in the consonantal system which occurred between the eleventh and early seventeenth centuries. One of the most distinctive features of Ukrainian phonetics, i.e., the appearance of h from etymological g, was completed

²²V.V. Nimčuk, ed., Leksykon slovenoros'kyj Pamvy Beryndy (Kiev, 1961), p. xviii.

²³M.K. Hruns'kyj, P.K. Koval'ov, Narysy z istoriji ukrajins'koji movy (L'viv, 1941), p. 53.

²⁴Nakonečnyj, p. 135; Bezpal'ko, p. 170.

by the twelfth century.²⁵ The phoneme g in modern Ukrainian is a foreign importation which began to appear in the late fourteenth century. At first this new sound was rendered by the combination кѣ, but by the end of the sixteenth century a new letter (ѣ) had been devised.²⁶ The date of the establishment of another foreign importation, the phoneme f, in the Ukrainian phonological system has not been fully investigated; however, Medvedjev informs us that "f was not indigenous to the Ukrainian language of the fourteenth or fifteenth or even later centuries."²⁷

Even in the Old East Slavic period, the dental stops (t, d) could possess a rather palatalized allophone whenever they (i.e., t and d) occurred before a front vowel; also subject to this allophonic palatalization were the consonantal phonemes s, z, p, b, m, v, r, l, n.²⁸ Although there is still considerable disagreement among scholars about exactly which front vowels produced what degrees of palatalization in the latter stages of Old East Slavic,²⁹ there is general agreement that these allophones achieved phonemic status only after the loss of weak jers in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. This meant that the consonants in question were no longer dependent on the following vowel

²⁵Ibid., p. 87.

²⁶Mytropolyt Ilarion [I. Ohijenko], Naša literaturna mova: jak pysaty j hovoryty po-literaturnomu (Winnipeg, 1958), p. 260. This was in the so-called Adelphotes or Greek grammar published in L'viv in 1591.

²⁷Medvedjev, Narysy..., p. 102.

²⁸Nakonečnyj pp. 139-142. V.V. Ivanov, Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moscow, 1964), pp. 100 and 172.

²⁹Ibid., pp. 172-174.

for their palatalized articulation.³⁰

One of the most characteristic features of the Ukrainian phonological system is the rather extensive degree to which it has undergone depalatalizations. These were all largely determined by various other phonological processes such as the loss of weak jers, the labialization of e after ž, š, č, j, the merging of the phonemes i and y, and the change in the articulation of e before hard consonants.³¹ As already indicated, there still exists a considerable difference of interpretation in establishing the dates of these processes, but the scope and purpose of this survey does not permit any investigation of these interesting but intricate problems. All that concerns us here is the reconstruction of the Ukrainian phonemic system as it existed in the early seventeenth century, and by that time it is certain that the original palatals (š', ž', č'), the palatalized labials (b', p', y', m'), and the affricative c' under certain conditions (before etymological e and i) had all depalatalized.³²

The origin of the other depalatalized affricative dž is still a hotly debated problem of Ukrainian phonological history.³³ For purposes

³⁰Ibid., pp. 244-248. S.B. Bernštejn, Očerk spavnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskix jazykov (Moscow, 1961), pp. 259-260. V.J. Borkovskij, P.S. Kuznecov, Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moscow, 1963), p. 110.

³¹Bezpal'ko, pp. 169-172.

³²Ibid., pp. 169-172, 174-175; Medvedjev, Narysy..., pp. 102-106, 107-108, and Nakonečnyj, pp. 130-144.

³³Nakonečnyj, pp. 145-150.

of this survey, however, it is sufficient to note that in documents of the sixteenth century there already existed a definite method of "spelling" dž (i.e., with d and ž as in modern Ukrainian).³⁴ The use of a definite means to distinguish this sound would indicate that it had already entered the phonemic consciousness of Ukrainian speakers of that time. It is also noteworthy that Pamvo Berynda in his dictionary of 1627 consistently used the "spelling" d + ž.³⁵

The affricates dž, dž' have no connection whatsoever with proto-Slavic dž', but are indigenous Ukrainian innovations. Unfortunately, little else is known about these phonemes, for Ukrainian historical grammarians all but ignore them, and the date of their establishment in the phonemic system has never been investigated. We do know, however, that Pamvo Berynda showed no consistency in the use of džv or zv in initial positions.³⁶ This is in striking contrast to his consistency in the use of dž; this would indicate that dž, although existing phonetically, had not as yet acquired phonemic status, for it was merely a positional variant of z in certain phonetic surroundings.

³⁴P.K. Kovaliv, Slovjans'ki fonemy: poxodžennja i istoryčnyj rozvytok (New York, 1965), p. 152.

³⁵Nakonečnyj, p. 146; J.K. Bilodid, Kurs istoriji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy (Kiev, 1958), Vol. I p. 91.

³⁶W. Witkowski, Fonetyka leksykonu Pamby Beryndy (Cracow, 1964), p. 40.

The problem of the depalatalization of r' presents special difficulties which go far beyond the scope and intent of this survey. The main difficulty is that r' did not depalatalize in the same positions in all of the dialects.³⁷ It is sufficient, however, to state that r' underwent depalatalization in all positions in those Ukrainian dialects with which Poles would have the greatest contact, i.e., the northern and southwestern dialects. With the exception of certain Carpathian and the majority of Pokutian sub-dialects (of the southwestern group), hard r or rj in all positions is a characteristic of these dialects even now,³⁸ and this feature was clearly established by the early seventeenth century; this is evident from the writings of those who originated from these dialectal regions.³⁹

On the basis of the foregoing, we are now in a position to reconstruct both the Polish and Ukrainian phonemic systems of the early seventeenth century.

Ukrainian

Polish

Vocalic Phonemes:

i u
 y
 iĕ uĭ
 e o
 a

i - (y) u
 e o ǒ
 e o
 a ǎ

³⁷Bezpal'ko, pp. 172-173.

³⁸Zylko, Narysy z dialektolohiji..., pp. 70 and 94.

³⁹Bezpal'ko, pp. 172-173; Medvedjev, Narysy..., p. 106.

Ukrainian

Polish

Consonantal Phonemes:

p	t	t'	k	p	p'	t	k	k'
b	d	d'	g	b	b'	d	g	g'
	s	s'	š x	f	f'	s	s'	š x
v	z	z'	ž h	v	v'	z	z'	ž
	c	c'	č			c	c'	č
			dž			dz	dz'	dž
	n	n'				n	n'	
	l	l'				l	l	
	r					r	ř	
	j					j		

Remarks:

1. In all likelihood â, ô no longer existed in the southeastern Polish dialects (narzecza kresowe) in the early seventeenth century.⁴⁰
2. According to Bidwell, y is a separate phoneme in Polish; according to Stieber, it is merely a "combinational variant" of i.⁴¹
3. One could object that the diphthongs iê and uî in Ukrainian could not exist simultaneously with i since the former are the immediate sources of the latter. However, the data of modern dialects show that wherever these diphthongs (or their immediate variants) exist, the distinction between etymological i and y is also maintained.⁴²
4. Regarding ř, see p. 52 fn. 2 above.

A perusal of these two systems shows that Ukrainian possessed six phonemes, iê, y, uî, t', d', and h, which were absent in Polish and would, therefore, present difficulties to Polish speakers when encountered in a loanword from Ukrainian. On the basis of known Ukrainian borrowings as cited in the etymological works of Bruckner and Sławski,⁴³ we can

⁴⁰Stieber, Rozwój fonologiczny..., pp. 42-43, and Klemensiewicz, et al., Gramatyka historyczna..., pp. 96-101.

⁴¹Stieber, Rozwój fonologiczny..., pp. 49-51, and Bidwell, Slavic Historical Phonology..., p. 45.

⁴²Žylko, "Pytannja fonolohičnoho aspektu...," p. 9, and Narysy z dialektolohiji..., p. 69.

⁴³Bruckner, Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego (Cracow, 1927), and Sławski, Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego (Cracow, 1952-1956), Vol. I. A-J, Vol. II fascicle 1, K-Kazn.

see how the Poles adapted Ukrainian loanwords containing these phonemes.

The examples cited from these two authorities (indicated by B for Bruckner and S for Sławski in parentheses after the example) will be given in the modern Polish form followed by their Ukrainian original in the AATSEEL transliteration.

Phoneme ie: (accented ě and e in syllable closed by soft consonant):
bies (B,S) < bis'; kisiel (B) < kysil'; sielski (B) < sil's'kyj; wiedma
(common throughout XVII century, B) < vid'ma.

Phoneme y: chatynka (S) < xatynka; na pohybel (B) < na pohybel';
rohatyna (B) < rohatyna, but Beskid (B) < Beskyd and kisiel (B) < kysil'
since ky is impossible in Polish.

Phoneme d': diak (B) < djak; popadia (B) < popadja; zawadiaka
(B) < zavodijaka; wiedma (Old Polish, B) < vid'ma; bodiak (B,S; in Old
Polish also bodak and bodziak, S) < budjak; kindziuk (B) < kendjux.⁴⁴

Phoneme h: błahey (S) < blahyj; druh (S) < druh; hodować (B,S) <
hoduvaty; hultaj (B,S) < hul'tjaj; łypac (B) < hlypaty; ramota (B) <
hramota; racuszki (reczuszki in Old Polish, B) < hrečušky.

Instructive but less accurate are the examples that can be gleaned from the spelling in the original texts of the famous interludes of Gawatowicz (1619) where colloquial Ukrainian (northern dialect)⁴⁵ is recorded in Polish orthography. Since it is generally accepted that the writer of these humorous sketches was not Gawatowicz himself,⁴⁶ there

⁴⁴Regarding the substitution of e by i in kindziuk, it must be borne in mind that, in all Ukrainian dialects except the northern ones, unaccented e has a tendency to narrow and to raise its point of articulation until it becomes almost indistinguishable from y (see Żylko, Narysy z dialektolokiji..., pp. 70, 91-92, 159-160). Therefore, it is not strange that Polish speakers would treat this sound in the same way as y. See also conclusion No. 3, p. 64. Regarding the substitution of x by k, see Stieber, Rozwój fonologiczny..., pp. 74-75.

⁴⁵Je. M. Markovs'kyj, "Do charakterystyky movy ukrajins'kyx intermedij XVII-XVIII stolit'," Pytannja istoryčnoho rozvytku ukrajins'koji movy (Kharkiv, 1962), pp. 99-102.

⁴⁶M. Voznjak, Počatky ukrajins'koji komediji (1619-1819) (L'viv, 1920), pp. 31.

is really no question of discovering how a Pole perceived the Ukrainian phonemes under discussion, but rather of how Polish orthography in the seventeenth century was geared to deal with them. In fact, M. Voznjak is of the opinion that Gawatowicz may have copied, that is, transliterated these interludes from some Cyrillic text.⁴⁷

All of the examples cited below are taken from the two interludes "Prodav kota v mišku" and "Najkraščyj son." This, along with the number of the line, will be indicated after each example by means of a p or an n,⁴⁸ representing the mentioned interludes.

Phoneme ui: bochmeś (p, 17), bohme (p, 57,99), buhme (p,184) <bihme(s'); pyru^hch (n,59), pyroh (n,80), pyri^h ; matunko (p,119), maty^ońko (p, 201)<matin'ko ; pu^d (p, 107,108)<pi^d ; pu^znałby (p, 210) <pi^znav by; pu^znaiesz (p, 84)<pi^znajeś; pu^ydu (p, 212), po^ydu (p. 216) <pi^jdu; bu^lsze (n,6,63)<bi^lše ; wu^d (n, 25)<vi^d ; mu^st (n,104)<mi^st ; vtiukłby (p, 80)<vti^k by ; żun^ki (n, 150)<żin^ky.

Phoneme h: horśczkami (p, 7)<horščkamy ; hroszy (p, 105,110) <hroši ; pyru^hch (n, 59), pyroh (n,86)<pyri^h : horeiut (n,152) < hori^jut' ; ohle^daty (p, 78), ochle^daty (n, 95)<ohl^jady ; zhlidyła (n,78), schli^dył (n, 121)<zhl^jadi(v)(la); wyhrał (p,119)<vyhrav ; zahle^diu (p, 135)<zah^jladi^v : ryciu (n,42)<hrycju.⁴⁹

Phoneme d': vidi^ty (p, 176)<vydi^ty ; idymże (n,1) <i^dim že ; dili^ty (n, 72), dyle^ty (n, 73,79)<dili^ty ; zahle^diu (p, 138)<zah^jladi^v ; zhlidyła (n, 78)<zhl^jadila ; dzie^aty (p, 123)<di^jaty ; diat sia (p, 205)<di^jet'sja ; po^delimo (n,58)<po^dilymo.

Phoneme t': su^t (p, 22; n, 100, 102, 103)<su^t' ; cho^t (p, 31,37; n, 29)<xot'; ty^sto (p, 47; n, 132)<ti^sto ; v ty^m (p, 54)<v ti^m ;

⁴⁷Voznjak, Počatky..., pp. 31-33.

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 180-192, 241-243.

⁴⁹The occasional confusion of h and x (graphemically ch) is probably a reflexion of the central and western dialects of the northern group in which voiced consonants become voiceless in absolute final position or before voiceless consonants. See F.T. Żylko, Narysy z dialektolohiji..., pp. 84 and 86.

pachnut (n, 53,54) < paxnut' ; ležyt (p, 189) < ležyt' ; chotyż (p, 55, 260) < xotiv ; vtiukłby (p, 89) < vtik by; matunko (p, 119), matyónko (p, 201) < matin'ko; brationkowe (n, 37) < bratink(ove) (y).

Conclusions:

1. The Old Ukrainian phoneme ie, although occurring very rarely in loanwords in Polish, is always replaced by 'e, that is, e with the ability to soften preceding consonants.
2. The other Old Ukrainian diphthongal phoneme, ui, is also replaced by a monophthong. It is occasionally rendered by o but in the vast majority of cases by u, which, after all, is how it was represented in Cyrillic texts as well.⁵⁰
3. As a phonetic entity the sound y exists in both Polish and Ukrainian, in Ukrainian as a separate phoneme, in Polish as a combinational variant of the phoneme i. Polish speakers, therefore, had no difficulty in perceiving this sound, but they made it conform to the same phonological rules applying to the Polish phoneme i - (y). That is, y after k, g or any of palatalized consonants is replaced by i.⁵¹
4. The vast majority of Polish dialects as well as the literary language does not distinguish the indigenous voiceless velar fricative x from the imported voiced laryngeal h. This distinction is still maintained artificially by the traditional orthography of Polish in which ch stands for the former and h for the latter sound. In actual fact, however, both

⁵⁰ Bezpál'ko, pp. 153-154, and Medvedjev, Narysy..., pp. 83-85.

⁵¹ Stieber, Rozwój fonologiczny..., pp. 49-51.

these graphemes (ch, h) represent one and the same phoneme (x) and are pronounced identically (x). S. Szober, nevertheless, informs us that

in the dialects neighboring with Czech, Slovak, and Ukrainian dialects and in the pronunciation of Poles coming from Lithuania and the Ukraine, the consonant sound represented by means of the letter h has a different ring⁵² than the consonant sound expressed ch, for the former is voiced.

This dialectal feature is no recent innovation, for it is definitely mentioned by such famous Polish scholars as P. Stojęński, Polonicae grammatices institutio (Cracow, 1568), G. Knapski, Thesaurus Polono-Latino-Graecus, Vol. I (Cracow, 1643), and M. Dobracki, Polnische deutsch-erklärte Sprachkunst (Oleśnica, 1669).⁵³ In each case, the writer cautioned his readers not to copy the pronunciation of those who confuse the sounds represented by ch and h. According to these writers, ch and h stand for two distinct sounds, and this distinction must be maintained by cultured speakers. Dobracki categorically stated that "only an ignoramus" would pronounce "chańba for hańba or chonor for honor."⁵⁴

Since most Ukrainian loanwords would enter Polish by way of the Kresy and since h was regarded as the cultured pronunciation, it is easy to understand why the Ukrainian phoneme h is consistently represented by the grapheme h. There is little or no confusion with ch, but there are a few cases where h disappears altogether before r (five examples) or

⁵²S. Szober, Gramatyka języka polskiego (Warsaw, 1959), p. 19.

⁵³M.R. Mayenowa, ed., Wypowiedzi o języku i stylu w okresie staropolskim (Wrocław, 1963), Vol. II, pp. 729-730.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 730.

l (only one example).

5. Both palatalized dental t', d' are treated in the same way in Polish. At morpheme boundaries and before front vowels no attempt is made to indicate palatalization. Before back vowels we may encounter the use of i (or j and y in older Polish orthography) in an attempt to simulate some degree of palatalized articulation (for example, in diak or Old Polish tiutuń). In some rare instances d' is rendered as dz' but t' is not changed to c'.

Dictionary of Ukrainianisms in Polish

The following vocabulary of Ukrainianisms in Polish is, in a sense, a short etymological dictionary, and therefore it will follow many of the well-established traditions employed in the compilation of such works. First, the language will be as telegraphic as clarity permits. Second, documentation will be given in parentheses within the body of each entry instead of in a footnote. Third, the documentation will be given as concisely as possible: the most commonly used references will be abbreviated to one or two capital letters; references from periodical publications will indicate only the author, the name of the periodical, its number, date, and page, but the actual title of the article will be omitted. In all cases the name of the publisher will be omitted, for this can readily be found in the bibliography. Pagination of references from dictionaries (i.e., works in which the information is arranged alphabetically) will be omitted whenever the entry in the vocabulary is in the same alphabetical order as that of the reference.

On the other hand, the scope of this vocabulary is much narrower than that of an etymological dictionary, for it is concerned only with proving the Ukrainian origin or intermediacy of a given term in Polish. Therefore, no attempt is made to give the complete etymology of every word listed in the vocabulary. First and foremost, this procedure applies to etymons from one of the Turkic languages; here the Turkic origin of the word is merely indicated without mention of any particular language(s). Bruckner, Sławski, Rudnyc'kyj, Machek, Holub and Kopečný all follow the same practice. To do otherwise would require not only special training

in Turkology, but in a work of this nature would also lead to an unnecessary accumulation of details. For instance, Vasmer is forced to cite seven Turkic languages as a possible source for arġamak, five for arkan, seven for berkut, six for den'gi, etc.

In those cases where Ukrainian acted only as an intermediary, the word is not cited in its original form because no English-language typewriter is equipped to handle all the intricacies of either a phonetic transcription or of the original orthography. The original form, however, will be cited in those few cases where it has some significance in proving Ukrainian intermediacy.

Similarly, the name of the author in whose writings any given word first appeared is cited only where this information has some bearing on whether or not the word is a Ukrainianism. Such information is, of course, redundant when dealing with a word whose Ukrainian origin is accepted by several competent authorities, or when the phonetics of the word itself definitely establish it as a Ukrainianism.

Each loanword will be cited with all its known derivatives, for they are loanwords too--"immigrants" of the second generation, so to speak--and can also be an excellent indication of the origin of the word. Normally a word will possess a wider range of derivatives in its language of origin than in its language of adoption. For example, from the root buhaj "bull" in Ukrainian we have the derivative buhajkuvatyj "bullish, over-sexed, lewd," while no such form is known in Polish. Furthermore, loanwords often tend to have derivative forms which correspond closely to the word formation patterns of the parent language. This is evident in such verbs as hajdamakować "to be rebellious, to be an insurgent" and kozakować "to be a Cossack," or in the adjective

durnieńki "a bit silly, rather stupid " The denominative suffix -ować having the meanings "to be, to lead the life of, to follow the occupation of" and the diminutive adjectival suffix -en'k- are much less productive in Polish than their Ukrainian¹ counterparts, and the fact that they occur here in Polish with the Ukrainian loanwords hajdamaka, kozak, and durny only helps to emphasize the Ukrainian origin of the latter.

The list of derivatives does **not** contain any forms which derive automatically from their root. This applies to the adverbial and nominal forms of an adjective (e.g., chyżo and chyżość from chyży) and the nominal form of a verb (e.g., hodowanie from hodować and droczenie from droczyć). Also excluded are the reflexive forms of all transitive verbs unless the addition of the reflexive particle się radically changes the meaning of the verb. Verbs are also cited only in one aspect and without prefixes which can be derived automatically and would only result in a vast number of forms having no real bearing on this study.

The vocabulary contains several examples of phonetic contaminations which are still loanwords as long as the particular phonetic contamination exhibited has not become an established feature of the host language. For this reason words like huzica in place of gęzica or kropla in place of kropia are included, but words like panicz or szepczę in place of

¹Z.Klemensiewicz, T. Lehr-Spławiński, S. Urbańczyk, Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego (Warsaw, 1955), pp. 232, and 247;
O. Synjavs'kyj, Normy ukrajins'koji movy (L'viv, 1941), pp. 99, and 135.

the older forms panic and szepeć are not because č for c in patronymics and conjugations resulting from Ukrainian influence is now a regular feature of Polish,² while h for g, the epenthetic l, or the substitution of a nasal by an oral vowel exist only in a few isolated cases.

²Šerech - Shevelov, "The Problem of Ukrainian-Polish Linguistic Relations from the Tenth to Fourteenth Centuries," Word, Vol. 8, No. 4, (suppl. Slavic Word) No. 1 (December, 1952), p. 339; T. Lehr-Spławiński, Język polski; pochodzenie, powstanie, rozwój (Warsaw, 1947), p. 278.

List of Abbreviations

- B Bruckner, A., Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. Cracow: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza, 1927.
- Hr Hrabec, S., Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy XVI i XVII wieków. Toruń: Nakład Towarzystwa Naukowego, 1949.
- JRoz Rozwadowski, J., "Historyczna fonetyka czyli głosownia języka polskiego," Encyklopedia polska Akademii Umiejętności, (1915), Vol. II, pp. 360-412.
- K Kovaliv, P., Leksyčnyj fond literaturnoji movy kyjivs'koho periodu X-XIV st. New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society Inc., 1962 (Vol. I), 1964 (Vol. II).
- L Linde, B., Słownik języka polskiego, Warsaw, 1804-1814; 2nd ed., Lwów: Ossolineum, 1854-1860; photo - offset reprinting, Warsaw : Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1951.
- R Rudnyc'kyj, J., An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Science, 1962 , fascicles 1-4 (A-Ven).
- S Sławski, F., Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. Cracow: Towarzystwo Miłośników Języka Polskiego, 1952, Vol. I - II fascicles 1-2 (A-Kor).
- SD Doroszewski, W., ed., Słownik języka polskiego. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1958 , Vol. I-VI (A-Prę).
- SW Karłowicz J., Kryński, A., Niedźwiecki, W., Słownik języka polskiego. Warsaw: Kasa imienia Mianowskiego, 1900-1927
- SWil Zdanowicz, A., Szyszko M., Filipowicz J., Słownik języka polskiego. Wilno: Orgelbrand, 1856-1861.
- SWO Rysiewicz, A., ed., Słownik wyrazów obcych. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1951; 2 nd ed., 1961.
- V Vasmer, M., Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg : Carl Winter. Universitätsverlag, 1953.
- YS Šerech - Shevelov, Y., "The Problem of Ukrainian-Polish Linguistic Relations from the Tenth to Fourteenth Centuries," Word, Vol. 8, No. 4, (suppl., Slavic Word), No. 1 (December, 1952), pp. 327-349.

Other Abbreviations:

adj.,	adjective	pn.,	proper noun
adv.,	adverb	Pol.,	Polish
aug.,	augmentative	PSl.,	Proto-Slavic
Belor.,	Belorussian	Rum.,	Rumanian
cen.,	century	Russ.,	Russian
dim.,	diminutive	s.m.	same meaning
Hung.,	Hungarian	Tur.,	Turkic
n.,	noun	Ukr.,	Ukrainian
plu.,	plural	v.,	verb

ARBUZ, see harbuz

ARKAN, n.: lasso, lariat; "from the Tatars through East Slavic" (B).

In L the earliest attestations are from Bardziński (of Łęczyca), 1691, and W. Potocki (from Galicia), 1695, which indicate Ukr. intermediacy from Ukr. arkán: lasso, a type of circle-dance, ultimately from Tur. (V).

BACHMAT, n.: Tatar steed; since XVI cen. in Rej from Ukr. baxmát: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (SWO).

Derivative:

bachmacik, n.: dim. of bachmat, little steed.

BAJDAK, n.: type of one-masted flatbottomed boat used in the Ukraine, Belorussia and on the Black Sea; since XVII cen. (L). from Ukr. bajdák: s.m., (SD), of uncertain origin (R,V).

BAKALIE, n., plu.: oriental sweetmeats, exotic confections; since XVII cen. in W. Potocki (L). B admits East Slavic intermediacy from Arabic through Tur. Obviously from Ukr. bakalíja: s.m., since in Russ. and Belor. we have bakaléja. Only Pol. and Ukr. have i.

Derivatives:

bakalijki, n. plu.: dim. of bakalie, individual candies or oriental confections.

bakaliowy, adj.: of or pertaining to bakalie.

BAKUN, n.: coarse pipe tobacco, any tobacco of poor quality; since XIX cen. (SW) from Ukr. bakún: s.m. (SD)

Derivative:

bakunowy, adj.: of or pertaining to bakun.

BAŁAGAN, n.: 1. chaos, bungle, muddle. 2. stall or booth at a fair;

since XIX cen. in T. Jeź and A. Groza with the 2nd meaning (SD), from Ukr. balahán: booth, stall, ultimately from Persian through Tur. (V). The g instead of h indicates Russ. influence, but the first users definitely indicates a Ukrainianism (S.W. Klich, Slavia Occidentalis, 1929, p. 434). The present meaning of chaos or muddle appears only in the XX cen. (SD).

Derivatives:

bałaganiarski, adj.: of or pertaining to bałaganiarz, q.v.

bałaganiarstwo, n.: tendency to be chaotic, propensity to bungle things.

bałaganiarz, n.: muddler, bungler, toddler.

bałaganić, v.: bungle, disorganize, create chaos.

bałaganik, n.: dim. of bałagan.

BAŁAMUT, N.: flirt, ladies' man, seducer; since XVI cen. "from Mongolian through East Slavic" (S). In L the earliest attestation is in J. Wereszczyński, 1594, who was born in Zbaraż and raised in Krasny Staw. This strongly indicates Ukr. intermediacy from balamút: s.m.

Derivatives:

bałamucić, v.: 1. flirt, try to seduce, 2. confuse.

bałamuctwo, bałamutnia, n.: 1. seduction. 2. confusion.

3. trash, buncombe.

bałamutny, adj.: confusing, misleading, seductive.

BANDEROWIEC, n.: supporter or member of the Ukrajíns'ka powstańs'ka ármija (Ukrainian Revolutionary Army); since late 1940's from the surname of the leader of the UPA, Stepan Bandera, plus the

Polish suffix - owiec, a calque from Ukr. banderivec' (SD).

BERDYCZÓW, pn.: only in the expression "pisz do mnie na Berdyczów", don't expect any answer, don't waste your breath; this expression is first attested in the late XVIII cen. (S. Adalberg, Księgi przysłów, Warsaw, 1889-94, p. 671), from the Ukr. city Berdýčiv (T. Lipiński, "Przysłowia i wyrażenia od miast i wsi," Biblioteka Warszawska, Vol. IV, 1852, p. 261).

BERKUT, n.: eagle; since XVII cen. "from Tatar through East-Slavic" (B), obviously from Ukr. berkút: s.m. as is proved by the non-palatalized b which is present in both the Russian and Belorussian forms of this word.

BESKID, pn.: Beskid Mountain Range; "East Slavic instead of Pol. Bieszczad" (B); as is obvious from the geographical location of this range and from the non-palatalized b from Ukr. Beskyd. Regarding the change of y to i, see page 64. It is first attested in 1569 (K. Dobrowolski, Studia historyczne ku czci S. Kutrzeby, Cracow, 1938, p. 205), although the older Pol. form Bieszczad is still encountered throughout the XVI-XVII centuries (V).

Derivative:

beskidzki, adj.: relating to the Beskid Mountains.

BEZHOŁOWIE, n.: confusion, anarchy, destruction; since XIX cen. in T. Jeż (SW) from Ukr. bezholóvja: s.m. (SD).

BIES, n.: devil; since XV cen. (B,S), "...possibly a Ruthenianism" (S), for PSL. *běsъ "...disappeared in Polish, but it returned in the XV cen., as Długosz clearly testifies, from East Slavic (often we had bis which is purely Ukrainian)" (B). In L the

earliest attestation is from 1578, "Rusini swoim językiem gdy komu łajali, Biesy, to jest szatany, często wspominali" in B. Paprocki, a Mazur. This would indicate a borrowing from Belor. The difficulty with this is that *bes is not attested in any Belor. dictionary although it may have still existed in the XVI cen. We can, therefore, assume two separate borrowings; bis is from southwestern Ukr. dialects, and bies either from old Belor. or from northern Ukr. dialects were ě still had a diphthongal quality (see pp. 43-46). See also bis.

Derivatives:

biesić się, v.: rage, go wild, act like a devil.

biesisko, n.: aug. of bies, great, ugly devil.

biesowski, biesowy, adj.: of or pertaining to the devil.

BIS, n.: devil, demon; since XV cen. (B,S) in S. Klonowic of Lublin, from Ukr. bis: s.m. (R.F. Kyrčiv, Slavistyčnyj zbirnyk, 1963, pp. 316-318). Although now generally displaced by the form bies, bis still appears in SD with the most recent attestation from 1883 in M. Romanowski.

Derivative:

bisić się, v.: rage, take a fit, act like a devil.

BISURMAN, n.: 1. Moslem, adherent of Islam. 2. heathen, infidel.

3. immoral, irreverent, debauched person; since the late XVI

cen. in M. Bielski (L) from old Ukr. bisurmán : Moslem. The

source is Tur. müsülman (B, SD, V); in East Slavic languages the

change m > b and l > r is universal, but the change of vowels is

varied; however, only Ukr. has i in the first syllable giving

bisurmán. "The influence of bis: devil, is evident" (R).

In modern literary Ukr. only busurmán is used.

Derivatives:

bisurmanić, v.: 1. convert to Islam. 2. debauch, demoralize.

bisurmanieć, v.: 1. turn Moslem. 2. become debauched, demoralized.

bisurmanin, n.: syn. of bisurman.

bisurmański, adj.: of or pertaining to bisurman.

bisurmaństwo, n.: 1. Islam, Moslem culture and faith. 2. irreligious, debauched, immoral mode of life.

BŁAHY, adj.: trifling, petty, insignificant; since XVI (B,S) from

Ukr. bláhyj: weak, indulgent, benevolent, impotent, trifling (S).

Derivative:

błahostka, n.: triviality, bagatelle, fiddle-faddle.

BOBAK, n.: marmot cat; since XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. babák : 1. marmot cat. 2. lazy fellow (SD). Possibly the second meaning had some influence on the Polish expression "spać jak bobak": sleep soundly, like a top. Its origin is still uncertain but likely from Tur. (V).

BODIAK, n.: thistle; since XIX cen. (S) from Old Ukr. bodják: s.m.

(S, SD, SWO). In Old Polish, we also encounter the forms bodak, bodłak, bodziak.

Derivatives:

bodiaczek, n.: dim of bodiak, little thistle.

bodiakowy, adj.: of or pertaining to thistle.

BODNIA, n.: large barrel, vat; since the XIX cen. in J. Kraszewski and S. Goszczyński from Ukr. bódnja: s.m. (SD).

BOHATER, n.: hero; since XVI cen. from Old Ukr. bohatýr (S),
ultimately from Tur. (V).

Derivatives:

bohaterka, n.: heroine.

bohaterski, adj.: heroic, courageous.

bohaterstwo, n.: heroism.

bohaterszczyzna, n.: stereotyped concept of a hero, false ideals
about heroism.

BOHOMAZ, n.: talentless painter, poor painting; since XVIII cen.

(L) from Ukr. bohómáz: painter of icons, poor painter (SWO).

The pejorative meaning is due to the fact that icon painter was
a very popular folk art in the Ukraine. Vast numbers practised
it, many with little success.

Derivative:

bohomazek, n.: dim. of bohomaz.

BOJAR(ZYN), n.: nobleman, baron of Rus', Lithuania or Moldavia; both

Ukr. bojar(yn) and Pol. bojar(zyn) are of Tur. origin (S,V), in

Kievan documents (the oldest stage of Ukr.) since X cen. (K II,156)

but in Pol. only since XV cen. from Old East Slavic bojarin (S),

that is, from Old Ukr. (M. Rudzińska, Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa
Językoznawczego, IV, 1935, p. 22).

Derivatives:

bojarowa, n.: wife of a nobleman, noblewoman.

bojarówna, n.: daughter of a nobleman.

bojarski, adj.: of or pertaining to a bojar.

bojarzyna, n.: petty, insignificant bojar.

bojarzynek, n.: dim. of bojarzyna.

BONDAR, n.: cooper, barrel maker; since XIX cen. in M.

Sienkiewicz from Ukr. bondár: s.m. (SD).

Derivative:

bondarowa, n.: wife of a cooper.

BORSUK, n.: badger; since XVI (B) or XVII cen. (L,S). According to

S, it is a "borrowing from southern Rus'", that is,

the Ukraine, from Ukr. borsúk: s.m., ultimately from Tur.

(B,S). Ukrainian intermediacy is also proved by the absence of akanije common to both the Russ. and Belor. forms.

Derivatives:

borsuczę, n.: young badger.

borsuczy, borsukowy, adj.: of or pertaining to badger.

brosuczyca, n.: female badger.

BORYKAĆ SIĘ, v.: struggle, strive; since XIX cen. (S) from Ukr.

borykátysja: s.m. (SD), which B describes as an "East

Slavicism" and S as a "Ruthenianism." Obviously a

Ukrainianism since it is absent in both Rus. and Belor.

BORYSZ, n.: gift given to the buyer by the seller after the completion

of a bargain, drink to seal a bargain, discount; since XVIII

cen. (L), from Ukr. barýš: profit, gain (R), according to SD

from Ukr. and Belor. The ultimate source is Tur. (B, R, SD, V).

BRAHA, n.: mash (for alcoholic drinks); since XVI cen. (B) from Ukr.

bráha: s.m. (SD,SWO). The ultimately source may be Celtic (B, K II, 125); this etymology is rejected by V.

BROCZYĆ, v.: cover or stain with blood, make bloody; since XVII cen.

(S) from Ukr. bročýty: s.m. (K. Nitsch, Studia z historii polskiego

słownictwa, Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1948, pp. 72-6). Ukr. bročýty is not to be found in any modern dictionary but is attested from the XVIII cen. (R, 212).

BRYNDZA, n.: ewe's cheese; since XVII cen. (S) from Ukr. brýnza: s.m. (Hr 90, P. Zwoliński, Dzieje języka ukraińskiego w zarysie, Warsaw, 1956, p. 35), ultimately from Rum. (B,S, SWO, V). As sources Hr cites Szymonowicz and Potocki. It is also interesting that G. Knapski, Thesaurus Polono-Lation-Graecus, Cracow, 1621, defined bryndza as caseus russicus.

Derivative:

bryndzarz, n.: maker or producer of bryndza.

BUHAJ, n.: bull, since XVII cen. (B,S) from Ukr. buháj; s.m. ultimately from Tur. (S, SD, SWO).

Derivative:

buhajek, n.: dim. of buhaj, little bull.

BUKŁAK, n.: leather bottle; since XVI cen. (B) in Rej (Hr 39) and Leopolita (L) from Ukr. dial. bokláh, boklák (Hr 39, 46-47), ultimately from Tur. (B, R 58).

Derivative:

bukłaczek, n.: dim. of bukłak.

BUŁANY, adj.: bay, dun, yellowish (only in reference to horses); "from Tur. through East Slavic" (B). The specific area of meaning strongly indicates Ukr. intermediacy (see p. 37), that is, from Ukr. bulányj: s.m. It is attested in L but without references.

Derivatives:

bułanek, n.: bay or dun horse (male).

bułanka, n.: bay or dun horse (female).

BUŁAT, n.: soble, scimitar of high quality steel (especially a curved Tur. or Persian blade); in both Ukr. and Pol. from Persian through Tur. (B,SD, V), attested in Kievan sources (the oldest stage of Ukr.) before the XIV cen. (K II. 140,151, 164) but in Pol. not until the mid XVI cen. (L) from East Slavic (B), in view of the date and area of meaning likely from Ukr. bulát: s.m.

Derivative:

bułatowy, n.: of or pertaining to a scimitar.

BUŁAWA, n.: mace, Cossack insignia or symbol of power; it is of undetermined origin appearing in Kievan documents (the oldest stage of Ukr.) before the XIV cen. (K II. 159) but in Pol. only since the XV cen. (S). In L, however, the earliest attestations are from 1613 in S. Syreński, born in Oświęcim and educated in Cracow, and from 1605 in F. Birkowski, born in Lwów and educated in Cracow, which strongly indicates Ukr. intermediacy rather than a later independent borrowing, therefore, from Ukr. bulavá: s.m.

Derivative:

buławnik, n.: type of forest lily.

BUŃCZUCZNO, adv.: proudly, haughtily, cockily; in L first attested in Prince A.K. Czartoryski, 1834-1823. This is not a direct loanword but a derivative from another loanword bunčúk. The interesting thing here is that the change in meaning was undoubtedly influenced by yet another Ukr. loanword bundjúčytysja which also gave birth to Pol. bunczyczyć się: put on airs, be haughty. It is interesting to note that the adv. buńczuczno appeared before the adj. form and only in such rhymed expressions as huczno buńczuczno, choć nie juczno ale buńczuczno: all show

and blow, or huczno i buńczuczno, szumno i tłumno: all fluster and bluster.

BUN(Ń)DIUCZYĆ SIĘ, v.: be proud, pompous, put on airs; first attested in F. Zabłocki, a Volhynian, 1754-1812 (L), from Ukr. bundjućytysja: s.m. (B).

Derivative:

bundiuczny, adj.: cocky, arrogant.

BUNDZIUCZYĆ SIĘ, v.: another form of bundiuczyć się not attested in L.

In SD the earliest attestation is from 1886 in J. Szujski.

Derivative:

bundziuczny, adj.: cocky, arrogant.

BUNĆZUK, n.: Tur. battle flag, symbol of power consisting of a staff and cross-piece on which were hung horse tails; since XVII cen. (L) from Ukr. bunćúk: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, SWO).

Derivative:

buńczucznik, n.: one who carries or is in charge of a buńczuk.

buńczuczny, adj.: cocky, arrogant.

buńczuczyć się, v.: be cocky, put on airs, strut like a peacock.

BURDZUICZYĆ SIĘ, v.: another form of bundiuczyć się also attested in L. from the late XVIII cen. but not in SD.

BURDZIUK, n.: goat skin contain; since XVII cen. from Ukr. bordjúh, bordjúk: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B). It first appears in Potocki (B,L). The change of o to u is best explained by the Ukr. feature of ukannje (pronunciation of unaccented o as u).

BURKA, n.: broad, short overcoat of felt; since XVII cen. in J.J. Susza and W. Potocki (L). According to B "in the XVII cen. it was

exclusively military, the insignia of a hetman, and a common soldier was allowed [to wear one] only after he had dispatched a Turk or Tatar (a noble stay-at-home who donned a burka would receive a real drubbing). . . . It came to us from the East through Rus'", that is, from Tur. through East Slavic (V). The original meaning of burka, so closely connected with Cossack custom & insignia, definitely indicates Ukr. intermediacy, i.e., from Ukr. búrka: felt coat.

BURŁAK, n.: vagabond, tramp, beggar; it is attested with this meaning in SWil, 1861, from Ukr. burlák: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (V). The more usual meaning of burłak: a Volga boatman, is of later origin and due to Russ. influence (SD).

Derivatives:

burłacki, burłaczy, adj.: of or pertaining to burlak.

burłactwo, n.: vagabondage, vagrancy, vagabond way of life.

BURY, adj.: dun, mousy, dark grey; in both Pol. and Ukr. from Tur. (S,V), in Pol. only since XV cen. (S) but in Kievan documents (the oldest stage of Ukr.) before the XIV cen. (K II 162, 265). In L the earliest attestation is from 1562 in M. Rej, all of which indicates Ukr. intermediacy instead of a later independent borrowing, therefore, from Ukr. búryj: s.m.

Derivative:

burzeć, v.: lose one's color, become dull or grayish.

BURZAN, n.: weed; since XIX cen. from Ukr. burján: s.m. (B, S, SD).

The substitution of rj with ž is unusual and unexplained.

BUSZOWAĆ, v.: ransack, prowl; since XIX cen. (S) from Ukr. bušuváty: s.m. (B, S, SD).

Derivative:

buszówka, n.: search, process of ransacking or rooting out.

CERKIEW, n.: Byzantine rite church; since XVI cen. in the present meaning under the influence of Ukr. cérkva: church (E. Klich, Polska terminologia chrześcijańska, Poznań, 1927, p. 88). However, in the meaning "church" in general it is attested as early as the XIV cen.(S). It is therefore, not a direct loanword.

Derivatives:

cerkiewka, n.: dim. of cerkiew, little Orthodox church.

cerkiewny, adj.: of or pertaining to the Eastern Church.

CHABETA, n.: nag, jade; since XIX cen. in H. Rzewuski (SD), according to S "maybe from Ukr." Although the root *xab- exists in other Slavic languages such as Czech, Slovak, and Russ., Ukr. is the only one where it appears with the suffix *et+a and in which the meaning has narrowed down to refer specifically to horses. Our word, therefore, is obviously from Ukr. xabéta: s.m.

Derivative:

chabetka, n.: dim. of chabeta, little nag.

CHANDRA, n.: doldrums, emotional depression, the blues; since XIX cen. in J. Kraszewski (SW), H. Rzewuski and A. Groza (SD) all closely connected with the Ukraine, from Ukr. xandra: s.m. (SW). According to SD it is from Ukr. and Russ., but B. merely states from East Slavic. The ultimate source is Greek (B, SD, V).

Derivative:

chandrować, v.: be melancholy, have the blues.

CHASZCZE, n.: thicket, shrubbery, thick bushes; since XVII cen. in

B. Zimorowicz, a native of Lwów, (L), from Ukr. xaščci: s.m. (Hr 117, SW).

Derivative:

chaszczyna, n.: a single thicket or clump of shrubbery.

CHATA, n.: hut, cottage (of a peasant); since XVII cen. (S) from Ukr.

xáta: house, dwelling (Hr 64), ultimately from Iranian (S) or from Old Hung. (V). According to SD, Pol. chata is from Ukr. and Belor.

Derivatives:

chacina, chateczka, chatenka, chatka, n.: dim. of chata, little house, cottage, shack, hut.

chatni, chatny, adj.: domestic, household.

CHATYNA, n.: cottage; since XIX cen. in T. Jeż from Ukr.

xatýna: s.m. (SD).

Derivative:

chatynka, n.: dim. of chatyna, dear little cottage.

CHŁYSTEK, n.,: youngster, shorty, squirt; since XVII cen. from Ukr.

xlýstyk: short whip handle, by extension anything short or small (S,SD). The suffix-yk has changed by analogy to -ek, which is so common in Pol. It is attested in L since the XVII cen.

CHOŁODZIEC, n.: type of soup made of beets, cream, boiled egg along

with cucumber or other vegetables and served cold; since

XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. xolodéc': s.m. (SD).

CHYŻY, adj.: brisk, swift, agile; since XVII cen. from Ukr. xýžyj:

predatory, rapacious, wild (S).

CZABAN, n.: shepherd; from Ukr. čabán: s.m., ultimately from Tur.

(S, SD, SWO), attested in L since the XVI cen.

Derivative:

czabański, adj.: of or pertaining to a shepherd.

CZAD, n.: coal gas; since XVII cen. first attested in M. Smotryc'kyj

(L, S) from Ukr. čad: s.m. (M. Onyškevyč, Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija, L'viv, 4, 1955, p. 154). The newness or foreignness of this word is clearly indicated by the fact that no verbal derivatives from the root čad are attested until the mid XIX cen. and even then only in writers connected with the Kresy, namely: czadzacy in J. Lelewel who was educated and later taught in Wilno (SD); zaczadzić in J. Kraszewski, who spent many years in Volhynia (SW); czadzić in M. Konopnicka, who was born in Suwałki.

Derivatives:

czadnia, n.: gas exit pipe, exhaust pipe.

czadnica, n.: gas producer or generator.

czadowy, adj.: of or pertaining to coal gas.

czadzić, v.: smoke up with coal gas or carbon monoxide.

czadzić, v.: give off or produce coal gas.

CZAHAR, n.: brushland; since XVII cen. (B) from Ukr. čahár: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, SD).

CZAJKA, n.: Cossack boat; since XVI (B, S) from Ukr. čajka: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (SD, SWO). B and S are indefinite, admitting only "East Slavic intermediacy". The meaning and geography obviously indicate a Ukrainianism.

CZAMBUŁ, n.: 1. detachment of cavalry (especially of Tatars) 2. foray, raid; since XVII cen. in W. Potocki (L) from Ukr. čambul: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, SD).

Derivative:

w czambuł, adv.: in a lump or mass, wholesale, holusbolus.

CZARA, n.: goblet, ceremonial drinking bowl; in both Pol. and Ukr. from Tur. (B, V), in Pol. only since the XVII cen. (L,S) but in Kievan documents (the oldest stage of Ukr.) since the XII cen. (K II.149, 263). In Pol. it first appears in Knapski, a Cracovian, (L), all of which strongly indicates Ukr. intermediacy rather than a later independent borrowing, therefore, from Ukr.

čára: s.m.

Derivative:

czareczka, czarka, n.: wine or whisky glass.

CZECZUGA, n.: 1. ornate Tatar sword. 2. type of sturgeon, acipenser ruthenus; since XVII cen. in W. Potocki (L) from Ukr. čečúha: meaning 2 only (SD, SW). In L czeczuga is first defined as "a variety of sturgeon which is caught in the Dnieper". This indicates that this was the original and more common meaning, and the meaning "a type of sword" appeared in second place. This latter meaning very likely arose in humorous reference to the long narrow shape of the fish and in imitation of such words as kolczuga, maczuga. This would also explain the Pol. substitution of g for original h.

CZEPIAĆ SIE v.: 1. catch in, fasten, stick to, hang on to. 2. pick at, carp; since XVII cen. in Smotryč'kyj and Ossoliński from East

Slavic (S). It is obviously a Ukrainianism because the Rus. form cepljat'sja, without č, and the Belor. capljacca with jakanije could not have produced the present Pol. form. The evidence of the first users, by itself, definitely indicates a Ukrainianism.

Derivatives:

czepny, adj.: clinging, climbing of plants.

odczepne, n.: something paid or given to get rid of someone.

przyczep, n.: 1. place where things join or meet. 2. insertio musculorum.

przyczepka, n.: 1. pretext for a quarrel. 2. sidecar, trailer.

przyczepny, adj.: adhesive, attachable.

przyczepowy, n.: specialist in making joins or insertions.

przyczepski, n.: intrusive person, pest, nuisance.

zaczep, n.: anchorage, hold.

zaczepka, n.: pretext for a quarrel, bone of contention.

zaczepny, adj.: aggressive, offensive.

CZEREDA, n.: herd, flock; since XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. čeredá: s.m. (SD).

CZEREMCHA, n.: wild cherry, chokecherry; since XVII cen. (S) from Ukr. čerémxa: s.m. (SD).

Derivative:

czerechow, adj.: of or pertaining to wild cherries or chokecherries.

CZEREP, n.: potsherd, skull; since XVIII cen. (L, S) from Ukr. čérep: s.m. (SW).

Derivative:

czerepiany, adj.: made of clay, clay-like.

CZEREŚNIA, n.: pincherry; since XVII cen. in Knapski (S) from Ukr.

čeréšnja: s.m.(M. Arct, ed., Podręczny słownik języka polskiego Warsaw: 1957). The change of šč > s' is best explained as an assimilation in point of articulation. Neither S nor B will commit themselves further than calling czereśnia an "East Slavicism". However, the date makes a Russ. borrowing unlikely, and a Belor. borrowing would show akanije by the XVII cen., that is čaréšnja (F. Hlebka, Narysy pa historyi belaruskaj movy, Minsk, 1957, pp. 71-4).

Derivatives:

czereszeńka, n.: dim. of czereśnia, little cherry.

czereśniowy, adj.: of or pertaining to cherries.

CZUMAK, n.: carter; from Ukr. čumak: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, SD), first used in the XIX cen. by J. Słowacki (SD).

Derivatives:

czumacki, adj.: of or pertaining to a czumak.

czumactwo, n.: czumak's occupation or way of life.

CZUPURNY, adj.: cocky, pugnacious, dare-devilish; since XVIII cen.

in J.S. Jabłonowski and A. Naruszewicz (S) from Ukr. čepurnýj,

dial. čuparnýj: elegant, smart, dashing (B).

CZUPRYNA, n.: fleece, head of hair, bushy hair; since XVI cen. in Rej

(B) from Ukr. čupryna: s.m. (Hr 36). Bruckner also admits

the possibility of a Ukrainianism, but rejects this on the grounds that "Rej had no borrowings of this sort." This, of course, is not so (Hr 46-47).

Derivatives:

czupryniasty, adj.: hairy, fuzzy, woolly.

czuprynka, dim. of czupryna.

CZUPURZYĆ SIĘ, v.: to be cocky, act important; since XIX in Z.

Kaczkowski, a Galician, from Ukr. čepurýtysja; dress elegantly, put on one's finery, spruce up, (SD). The adaption of this word into Pol. was likely aided by the existence of czupurny, q.v.

CZYRAK, n.: boil, abscess; since XVIII from East Slavic (S) obvious

from Ukr. čyrják, dial. čyrák: s.m. since the root with this suffix does not exist in other East Slavic languages.

Derivatives:

czyrakowaty, adj.: covered with or infested with boils.

czyrakowy, adj.: of or pertaining to boils or abscesses.

DERA, n.: horseblanket, saddle cloth; since XV (S) or XVII-XVIII centuries

(L) from Old Ukr. dérha: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, S, SWO, SD).

Derivative:

derowy, adj.: of or pertaining to a saddle cloth.

DERÉN, n.: cornel, dogwood; since XVII cen. in its present form,

(S) from Ukr. derén: s.m. (B). The palatalized n in Pol. is

secondary; when it first appeared in the XV cen., it had the form

deren (B, S, SD) which corresponds exactly to the Ukr.

Derivatives:

dereniak, dereniówka, n.: liquor made from dogberries.

derenina, n.: single dogwood tree or shrub.

dereniowaty, adj.: similar to or like a dogwood.

dereniowy, adj.: of or pertaining to dogwood.

DERKA, see dera.

DERKACZ, n.: land rail, killdeer; since XVIII cen. (S) from Ukr.

derkáč: s.m. (SD, V).

DREWUTNIA, n.: woodshed; since XIX cen. in the second edition of L.

1854, added by J. Zaluski, a Galician. In the first edition, 1807-14, only drywotnia with the remark: "... źle mówią miasto wiorzysko" and with a quotation from M. Dudziński from Belorussia. According to S. Szober, Słownik poprawnej polszczyzny, Warsaw, 1937, drewutnia in a "southern provincialism". It is obviously from XVI-XVII Ukr. dryvōtnja (<*drivotēnja): s.m. There is no other way to account for the formant morpheme, /u/, in the Pol. form. The dre instead of dry can be explained as assimilation to such Pol. form as drewno, drewniany, drewnieć, drewko.

DROCZYĆ (SIEĆ), v.: tease, torment; since XIX cen. in Słowacki from Ukr. dročyty: s.m. (S).

DRUH, n.: friend, comrade; since XVII cen. (S) from Ukr. druh: s.m. (Hr 102, S) though S admits possibility of a Belorussianism.

Derivative:

druhna, n.: bridesmaid.

DUKACZ, n.: string of coins worn as a necklace; since XIX cen. from Ukr. dukać: s.m. (SD). The ultimate origin is Italian ducato: coin, money, altered with a Slavic suffix.

DUMA, n.: epic in song, historical ballad (usually of a sad or serious nature); since XVI cen. from Ukr. dúma: s.m. (R.F. Kyrčiv, Slavistyčnyj zbirnyk, I, 1963, pp. 311-313.)

DUMAĆ, v.: think, muse, ponder; since XV cen. (S) in Biernat, S. Szarzynski, and Szymonowicz from Ukr. dúmaty: s.m. (Hr 15-16, 83.)

DUR, n.: 1. confuse of the senses, madness. 2. any sickness which

causes one to lose one's senses (often applied exclusively to typhus); meaning 2 is newer, appearing first in SWil, 1861.

In L, with meaning 1, the earliest attestation is from 1629, in M. Smotryc'kyj. This definitely indicates that this word is from Ukr. dur: madness, stupidity, folly. It could not be a native Pol. word since PSL. *durę would have given *durz (S, V).

Derivatives:

durnieć, durzeć, v.: become foolish or stupid, lose one's wits.

durnieńki, durnowaty, adj.: somewhat foolish, slightly stupid.

durny, adj.: stupid, foolish.

durowy, adj.: of or pertaining to typhus.

durzyciel, n.: deceiver, trickster.

durzyć, v.: fool, deceive, delude.

durzyć się, v.: be in love, have a crush on someone.

DUREŃ, n.: fool, stupid fellow; since XVII cen. in W. Potocki,

J. Jabłonowski of Volhynia, and P. Mohyla (L), from Ukr. dúren': s.m. (J. Reczek, Język Polski XLIV, 5, pp. 276-282).

Derivative:

dureniek, n.: dim. of dureń, little fool.

DŻUMA, n.: plague, black death; since XIX cen. from Ukr. čumá:

s.m. (S). The substitution of č with dź as well as the etymology of the word itself have never been fully clarified. S favors Tur., SWO, Rum.; and B, Hebrew.

Derivatives:

dżumowy, adj.: of or pertaining to the plague or black death.

zadżumić, v.: infect with the black death.

FUJARA, n.: shepherd's pipe, reed flute; since XVIII cen. (S). from

Ukr. dial. fujára: s.m. (Bruckner, Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, XVI, p. 206) although S also admits the possibility of a borrowing from either Slovak or dial. Rum.

Derivatives:

fujareczka, fujarka, n.: dim. of fujara.

fujarkowy, adj.: of or pertaining to fujara.

FUTOR, n.: manor; since XVII cen. (L) from Old Ukr. xútōr > modern

Ukr. xútir: s.m. (B, SD, SWO). Regarding the change of x to f, see Z. Stieber, Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego, Warsaw, 1958, p. 63.

Derivatives:

futorek, n.: dim. of futor, little manor.

futornik, n.: owner of a manor.

futorzanin, n.: resident (male) of a manor.

futorzanka, n.: resident (female) of a manor.

GOŁĄBKİ, n., plu.: cabbage rolls; since XIX cen., formed under the influence of Ukr. holubcí: s.m. (S); therefore, this is a calque, not a direct borrowing.

GRZĄSKI, adj.: oozy, slimy; since XVII cen. under the influence of Ukr. hruz'kýj, hrjaz'kýj: s.m. (S). This is another example of a calque. In XVI cen. in Paprocki, we find hruski (B, S) directly from Ukr.

GUSŁA, n., plu.: sorcery, witchcraft; since XIV cen. under the influence of Ukr. húsła or Old Ukr. gusla: a type of plucked instrument played by sorcerers and magicians, an example of

phonetic contamination with Pol. geśli: rebec (YS, 334-7).

Derivatives:

guślarka, guślarzycha, n.: sorceress, witch.

guślarski, adj.: of or pertaining to sorcerers and sorcery.

guślarstwo, n.: sorcery, witchcraft, arts of magic.

guślarz, n.: wizard, sorcerer.

GUZICA, n.: rump (of a bird), pope's nose; since XVI-XVII cen.

instead of huzica encountered in Knapski, Pasek and Potocki from Ukr.

huzycja: s.m. (B, S) or instead of geżica from PSl. *gożic'a (S).

Therefore, guzica is an example of phonetic contamination. Only the u is Ukr.

HAJDA, interj.: be gone, let's go, forward; since XVIII cen.

from Ukr. hajda: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (S, SD).

HAJDAMAK(A), n.: Ukrainian insurgent, Cossack rebel; since XVIII cen.

from Ukr. hajdamaka, ultimately from Tur. (S, SD, SWO).

Derivatives:

hajdamacki, hajdamaczy, adj.: of or pertaining to the hajdamaka's.

hajdamactwo, n.: life, actions, customs of hajdamakas

hajdamaczka.: 1. wife of a hajdamaka, female hajdamaka 2. tomboy.

hajdamaczyć, hajdamakować, v.: be a hajdamaka, lead the life of a hajdamaka

hajdamaczyzna, n.: period of the hajdamaka insurgency.

HAJDEWERY, n., plu .: broad trousers as worn by Cossacks; since XIX cen. (S) from Ukr. hajdevéry: s.m., (S, SWO, SD).

HALABURDA, n.: blusterer, bully, brawler; since XVIII cen. (S) from dial. Ukr. halabúrda: disorder, trouble, mêlée. (S, SWO, SD).

Derivative:

hałaburdostwo, n.: tendency or inclination to quarrel, fight or make trouble.

HAŁAS, n.: noise, din, row; since XVII cen. in B. Zimorowicz from Ukr. hálás; s.m. (S, SD).

Derivatives:

hałasic, halasować, v.: make a noise, be boistrous.

hałasownik, n.: noisy or boistrous fellow.

hałasowny, hałasliwy, adj.: noisy, boistrous, blustering.

HAŁASTRA, n.: 1. rabble, mob. 2. noise rumble; since XVII cen. in Knapski where it appears as chałastra (S). It is still spelled thus in B which more closely corresponds to the original dial. Ukr. xalástra (S, SD). Modern Ukr. uses only the form halájstra. The origin is still uncertain (S).

HARATAĆ, v.: 1. hack, mangle, pull apart. 2. criticize savagely; since XIX cen. from Ukr. dial. haratáty; s.m. (S).

HARBUZ, n.: watermelon; since XVIII cen. from Ukr. harbúz: melon, pumpkin (S), now generally replaced by arbuz, an older borrowing directly from Tur. (S). The newer form with h is used almost exclusively in the expression "dostać harbuza": be refused, turned down in a love affair.

HARHARA, n.: anything that is large, clumsy or awkward; since the XIX cen. (SW) from Ukr. harhára: ugly, quarrelsome woman (SD).

HARKOT, n.: throaty speech, guttural pronunciation; since XIX cen. from Ukr. harkóta; s.m. (S). The dropping of final a is best explained by assimilation to other Pol. forms in ot as

charkot, hurkot, szwargot.

HARMIDER, n.: row, hullabaloo; since SVII (B) from Ukr. harmýder:
s.m., ultimately from Persian through Tur. (S, SWO).

HARNY, adj.: nice, fine; since the XIX cen. (SD, SW) from Ukr.
hárnýj: s.m. (SD).

HODOWAĆ, v.: raise cattle, vegetable; since XVI cen. in Strykowski
(B,S) from Ukr. hoduváty: feed, nourish, fatten (B, S).

Derivatives:

hodowca, n.: grower, breeder (of cattle).

hodowczyni, n.: fem. form of hodowca.

HODOWLA, n.: raising of cattle vegetables; since XIX cen. (S) from
Old Ukr. hodóvlja: nutrition, feed, forage (B, S. YS 339).
In modern Ukr. we have only hodivlja.

Derivative:

hodowlany, adj.: of or pertaining to cattle breeding.

HOJDAĆ, v.: swing; since XIX cen. from Ukr. hojdáty: s.m. (S).

Derivative:

hojdałka, hojdawka, n.: swing (for children).

HOŁOBLA, n.: thill; since XVI cen. (S) from Ukr. holóblja: s.m.
(S, B, SD, SWO).

Derivative:

hołobelny, adj.: of or pertaining to thills.

HOŁOTA, n.: rabble, ruffraff; since XVIII cen. (S) from Ukr. holóta:
s.m. (S, SWO).

HOŁUBCE, n., plu.: cabbage rolls; since XIX cen. in T. Jeż (S), from
Ukr. holubcí: s.m. (B, S, SD).

HOŁUBIĆ, v.: cuddle, pet; since XIX in T. Jeż and H. Sienkiewicz (S)
from Ukr. holúbyty: s.m. (B, S, SD).

HOŁUBIEC, n.: step in dancing, jump accompanied by clicking of heels;
since XVII cen. in Zimorowicz (S, Hr 109) from Ukr. holubéc':
s.m. (S, Hr 109, SWO, SD).

HOŁYSZ, n.: pauper, poor wretch; since XVIII in Naruszewicz (S) from
Ukr. holýś: s.m. (S SWO, SD).

HOPAK, n.: Ukrainian folk dance, hopak; since XIX cen. (SW) from Ukr.
hopák: s.m. (SD).

HORDA, n.: horde (of Tatars, Mongols, etc.); since XVI cen. from Ukr.
(h)ordá: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, S, Hr 42).

HOROD, n.: town, city of long standing (with reference to those towns
in the eastern part of the former Polish Empire); since XVII cen.
in P. Mohyla (L), from Ukr. hórod: ancient town, city (B).

Derivative:

horodnia, n.: attachment built against the fortified wall of a
town or castle.

HORODNICZY, n.: chief magistrate or major of a horod, q.v., since
XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. horodnýčyj: s.m. (B).

Derivative:

horodniczanka, n.: daughter of a mayor.

HORODYSZCZE, n.: site of a former city, its ruins; since XIX cen. (SD),
from Ukr. horodýšče: s.m. (B, SD). however, in the form
horodziszcze, it appears as early as the XVI in M. Strykowski (B, L).

HOSPODAR, n.: ruler of Moldavia or Wallachia; since XVIII cen. (B) from
Ukr. hospódar: master, householder, ruler (B, SD, SWO).

Derivatives:

hospodarczyk, n.: son of or candidate for the office of hospodar.

hospodarować, v.: be a hospodar, be a ruler of Moldavia.

hospodarski, adj.: of or pertaining to a Moldavian ruler or nobility.

hospodarstwo, n.: 1. wife and family of a hospodar. 2. office and duties of a hospodar.

HOŻY, adj.: fresh, blooming; since XVI cen. (S) from Ukr. hóžyj: s.m. (B, S, Hr 111, SD).

HRAMOTA, n.: royal charter (with reference to Imperial Poland, (1569-1772); since XVI cen. (B) from Ukr. hrámota: document, charter (B, SD), also appears as ramota q.v.

HRECZKA, n.: buckwheat; since XVI cen. in Strykowski (S) from Ukr. hréčka: s.m. (B, S, SD).

Derivatives:

hreczany, adj.: made with buckwheat.

hreczkowy, adj.: of or pertaining to buckwheat.

HRECZKOSIEJ, n.: hick, hayseed, stick-in-the-mud; since XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. hrečkosíj (B, SD). The final morpheme has been replaced by its Polish counterpart which makes it more meaningful for Pol. ears.

HUBA, n.: touchwood, amadou, parasite fungus which grows on stumps; since XV cen. but in XVI - XVIII centuries with the meaning of any mushroom other than the boletus, from Ukr. hubá: mushroom, (S).

Derivatives:

hubczasty, hubczaty, adj.: supplied with or using tinder

hubiasty, adj.: 1. containing mushrooms, rich in mushroom.

2. mushroom-shaped.

hubka, n.: tinder made from dried fungus (hubá).

HULÁĆ, v.: revel, carouse; since XVII cen. from Ukr. huljáty: s.m.

(B, S, SD).

HULAKA, n.: play-boy, reveller; since XVII cen. from Ukr. huljáka s.m.

(B, S).

Derivatives:

hulacki, adj.: frivolous, licentious, dissolute.

hulactwo, n.: dissolute, irresponsible way of life.

HULANKA, n.: revelry, carousal, eebauch; since XVIII cen. from Ukr.

huljáuka: s.m. (B, S).

HULASZCZY, adj.: crapulous, licentious, frivolous; since XVIII (L, S)

from Ukr. huljaščyj: s.m. (B, S, SD).

HULTAJ, n.: rascal, rogue, play-boy; since XVI cen. (Hr 53, 70) from

dial. Ukr. hul'taj: s.m. (B, S, SD), instead of the modern Ukr. hul'tjaj.

Derivatives:

hultaić się, v.: lead a dissolute life, be a rogue.

hultajka, n.: loose, irresponsible woman,

hultajski, adj.: roguish, rascally.

hultajstwo, n.: rascaldom, roguery.

HURKOT, n.: rumble, thunder, since XIX cen. (S) from Ukr. húrkot: s.m.

S admits a Ukrainianism only as a possibility. However, since the first users of hurkot are S. Goszczyński and J. Korzeniowski

(SD), it is almost certainly a Ukrainianism. The change of

-it to -ot is best explained as assimilation to other Pol. words

with the suffix -ot as charkot, szwargot, turkot, etc.

Derivative:

hurkotać, v.: thunder, rumble, whirl.

HURMA, adv.: en masse, in a crowd, in swarms; since XVI cen.

(S) from Ukr. hurmoju: s.m. (SW, Hr 13, 67, T. Lehr-Spławiński, ed., Słownik języka polskiego, Warsaw, 1959). The ultimate source is still undetermined (S).

HURMEM, another form of hurma, q.v.

HYDZIĆ, v.: make sick, nauseate, disgust; since XVI cen. (B, S)

from Ukr. hydýty: s.m. (SD, Hr 23-4). In modern Pol. it appears only in derivatives: ohydzić, zohydzić, ohyda and ohydny, all of which have been common in Pol. since XVI cen. (B).

IHUMEN, n.: father superior, abbot of an Orthodox monastery; first attested in SWil, 1861, from Ukr. ihumén: s.m. ultimately from Greek (SD).

Derivative:

ihumenstwo, n.: office, position and duties of an abbot.

JAR, n.: ravine; since XVI cen. from Ukr. jar: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, S, V).

Derivative:

jarowy, adj.: of or pertaining to a ravine.

JARMUŁKA, n.: skull cap (especially as worn by Orthodox Jews); since XVI cen. from Ukr. jarmúlka: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, S).

JASYR, n.: captivity (especially by Turks or Tatars); since XVII (B) or XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. jasýr: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B).

JEŁOP, see jołop, q. v.

JOŁOP, n.: blockhead, dunce; since XIX (S) from Ukr. jólop: s.m.,
(S, SWO, SD), possibly of oriental origin (S).

KABAN, n.: boar; since XIX cen. from Ukr. kabán: s.m., ultimately
from Tur. (S).

Derivatives:

kabani, adj.: of or pertaining to hogs.

kabaniarstwo, n.: raising, breeding of hogs.

kabaniarz, n.: 1. breeder of hogs. 2. swineherd.

kabanina, n.: pork.

KACAP, n. pej.: Muscovite, Russian; since XIX cen. (S) from Ukr.
kacáp: s.m. (B, S, SD).

Derivatives:

kacapka, n.: fem. form of kacap, derogatory name for a
Russian woman.

kacapski, adj.: Russian, Muscovite.

KACZAĆ, v.: roll, tumble; since XIX cen. from Ukr. kačáty: s.m. (S).

KACZAN, n.: heart (in a head of cabbage), cob of corn; since
XIX cen. from Ukr. kačán: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (S, SWO,
SD). Both S and SWO also admit the possibility of Rus. borrowing,
i.e., from kočán.

KAJDANY, n., plu.: chains, shackles, bondage; since XVI cen. (B, S)
from Ukr. kajdány: s.m., ultimately from Arabic through Tur.
(S, SWO, Hr 73).

Derivatives:

kajdaniarski, adj.: of or pertaining to convicts.

kajdaniarstwo, n.: 1. penal servitude. 2. convict's way of
life.

kajdaniarz, n.: convict, on in fetters.

kajdanki, n., plu.: handcuffs, manacles.

kajdanowy, adj.: of or pertaining to fetters, shackles.

KALEKA, n.: cripple; from the XVI to XVIII cen., it always appeared as kalika (S, Hr 74, 129) from Ukr. kalíka: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, S, Hr 74). The modern Pol. form is due to later Rus. or Belor. influence (S).

Derivatives:

kalectwo, n.: crippled or disabled condition.

kaleczyć, v.: become crippled, maimed.

kaleczy, adj.: of or pertaining to a cripple.

kaleczyć, v.: cripple, maim, murder a language.

KALETA, n.: money pouch; since the XVI in Rej from Ukr. kalytá: s.m. (Hr 46-47) or from Ukr. and Belor. (S), ultimately from Tur. (B, S, V). The e in Pol. kaleta is still unexplained; however, it must be remembered that l before e in Pol. is hardly palatalized at all. Therefore, it more closely corresponds to the pronunciation of hard l in Ukr. kalytá than to soft l in Belor. kalita. This plus the fact of the first user makes a Ukr. borrowing seem more likely.

Derivatives:

kaletka, n.: little purse.

kaletniczy, adj.: of or pertaining to a purse-maker.

kaletnik, n.: purse-maker.

KAPCIUCH, n.: tobacco pouch; since XVIII cen. from Ukr. kapšúk, kapčúk: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (S). According to S the substitution

of c' for š (č) is the result of mazurzenie, and the substitution of x for k is the result of hypercorrection (Z. Stieber Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego, Warsaw, 1958, pp. 74-75).

KAPRAWY, adj.: watery, bleary (of eyes); since XVIII cen. from Ukr.

kaprávyj: s.m. (S). In L it is attested in Perzyna, Minasowicz, Zabłocki, all of whom are associated with the Kresy.

Derivatives:

kaprawiec, n.: one who has bleary, watery eyes.

kaprawieć, v.: become bleary-eyed.

KARASKAĆ SIĘ, v.: get out of, extricate oneself, get away from; since XVII cen. in W. Potocki in the form skaraskać się from Ukr.

skaráskatysja: s.m. (S). S also admits the possibility of a Belor. borrowing, but this is hardly likely in view of the first user (Z. Stieber, Uwagi o języku Wacława Potockiego, Łódź, 1947, pp. 24-5). In modern Pol. this verb usually appears with the prefix vy-, occasionally with od- or s-.

KARUK, n.: isinglass, glue; since XVII cen. in Potocki from Ukr. dial.

karúk: s.m. (B, S), possibly from Tur. (S).

KARY, n.: black (of horses); since XVI (S) or XVII cen. (B) from Ukr.

káryj: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, S, Hr 74, 76).

KAWON, n.: watermelon; since XVIII cen. (S) from Ukr. kavún: s.m.

ultimately from Tur. (B, S). According to S the vowel o instead of u is the result of lowering in articulation before a sonant.

KINDIAK, n.: ribbon, headband; since XVII cen. from East Slavic (B),

but in L defined as "na Ukrainie wierzchnia suknia białogłów",

obviously, therefore, from Ukr. kyndják: s.m. The ultimate source is Tur. (V).

KINDZIUK, n.: pig's stomach (for sausage, etc.) from Ukr. kendjux:

s.m., (B). Regarding the change of e to i and x to k, see page 62, fn. 44. The ultimate source is Tur. (A. Zajaczkowski, Studia orientalistyczne z dziejów słownictwa polskiego, Wrocław, 1953, p. 43). It is not registered in L, and B gives no date.

KOBZA, n.: kobza, Ukrainian stringed instrument; since XVII cen. in J.B. Zimorowicz (B) from Ukr. kóba: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, SD, SWO).

Derivatives:

kobzarski, adj.: of or pertainign to a kobza player.

kobz(i)arz, n.: kobza player.

KOCIUBA, n.: oven rake, instrument clearing out ashes; since XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. kocjuba; s.m. (B), ultimately from Tur. (SD).

KOCZOWAĆ, v.: wander, lead a normadic life; of Tur. origin (B, SD, V) in Pol. through East Slavic (B). It is attested in Kievan sources (the oldest stage of Ukr.) before the XIV cen. (K II, 228) but not in Polish until 1650 in S. Twardowski a Cracovian, and 1663 in B. Zimorowicz of Lwów (L). All this plus the absence of akanije strongly indicates Ukr. intermediacy, that is, from Ukr. kočuvaty: s.m.

Derivatives:

koczowisko, n.: normad encampment.

koczownictwo, n.: normadic mode of life.

koczowniczy, koczowny, adj.: normadic, wandering.

koczownik, n.: nomad, wanderer.

KOLASA, n.: calash, carriage; since XVI - XVII centuries (B) from Ukr.

koljása: s.m. (SD, SWO).

Derivative:

kolaseczka, kolaska, n.: dim. of kolasa.

KOŁOMYJA, p.n.: only in the expression "Francuz z Kołomyi": a person who affects foreign manners and dress; since XIX cen. (T. Lipiński, "Przysłowie i wyrażenia od miast i wsi", Biblioteka Warszawska, IV, 1852, p. 301) from the Ukr. city Kolomyja.

KOŁOMYJKA, n.: Ukrainian dance and type of folk song; first attested in XIX cen. (SW) although known in Poland in the XVII cen. (personal information from J. Chomiński, musicologist, University of Warsaw) from Ukr. kolomyjka: s.m.

KOŁTUN, n.: 1. plica, elf-lock 2. obscurant; 3. backward or impoverished nobleman; since XVII cen. (B, L) from Old Ukr. kóltun: s.m. (V). In L the earliest attestation is from 1613 in S. Syreński of Oświęcim and Cracow, and B quotes E. Syxt, 1617, as saying "... this disease [koltun] appeared in Rus', in Pokutia, and along the Beskid...", which also indicates the Ukr. origin of this word.

Derivatives:

kołtuneria, kołtuństwo, n.: obscurantism, narrowmindedness, philistinism.

koltuniasty, adj.: infected with plica.

kołtunić, v.: infect with plica.

kołtuniec, v.: 1. become infected with plica. 2. become unprogressive or superstitious.

kołtunka, n.: impoverished or backward noblewoman.

kołtunowaty, adj.: 1. tousled, matted (of hair). 2. somewhat ignorant, obscurantist.

kołtunowy, adj.: of or pertaining to plica.

kołtuński, adj.: backward, ignorant, anti-intellectual.

KOMYSZ, n.: reed, thicket, lair; since XVII cen. in the form komesz, with y since the XVIII cen. (B) from Ukr. komýś: s.m., (B, SWO, SD).

KORCIC', v.: urge, have a longing, be tempted; since XVII cen. in Potocki from East Slavic (B), obviously from Ukr. kortíty: s.m. The etymon is unknown in Rus. and in Belor. with akanije.

KOROMYSŁO, n.: yoke for carrying pails, etc.; since XIX cen. (SW) from Ukr. korómyslo: s.m. (B, SD).

KOROWAJ, n.: ceremonial wedding bread (only in reference to Ukr. weddings); from Ukr. korováj: s.m. (SD, SWO). According to Bruckner, an East Slavicism, but the lack of akanije strongly indicates a Ukrainianism. In L it is attested since the XVIII cen. and defined as "chleb wielki weselny na Rusi".

KOROWÓD, n.: procession, formalities; from Ukr. korovíd; round or circle dance, formalities (B, SD), attested in L since the XVIII cen.

KOZAK, n.: Cossack; since XV cen. where it first appears in Jan Długosz (L. Podhorodecki, Sicz. Warsaw, 1960, p. 18) from Ukr. kozák: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, SWO, SD).

Derivatives:

kozacki, kozaczy, adj.: of or pertaining to Cossacks.

kozactwo, n.: 1. Cossacks. 2. Cossack way of life and customs.

kozaczę, n.: servant, pageboy.

kozaczka, kozaczycha, n.: 1. wife or sweetheart of a Cossack.

2. tomboy. 3. female Cossack.

kozaczyć, kozakować, v.: be a Cossack, lead the life of a Cossack.

kozaczyna, n.: petty, insignificant, miserable Cossack.

kozaczyzna, n.: period of Cossack power and wars.

kozakowaty, adj.: Cossack-like, brave, daring.

KROPLA, n.: drop; since the XIV cen. under the influence of Ukr.

kráplja: s.m., an example of phonetic contamination (YS 339).

Here only the epenthetic l is Ukr., kropia being attested in Old Pol. (V).

Derivatives:

kroplany, kropolowy, adj.: of or pertaining to drops.

kroplić się, v.: 1. form drops. 2. cover with drops.

kroplik, n.: type of flower with drop-shaped blossoms.

kroplisty, adj.: drop-like, have the shape of a drop.

kroplomierz, n.: eye-dropper.

KRYNICA, n.: well, spring; since the late XVI cen. in Rej, Orzechowski,

and Klonowic from Ukr. krynýcja: s.m. (Hr 26, YS 340). In L

the earliest attestations are from 1609, in A. Wargocki, of Przemyśl and from 1613 in F. Birkowski of Lwów.

Derivatives:

krynicowy, kryniczny, adj.: of or pertaining to a spring or well.

kryniczka, n.: little spring.

kryniczysko, n.: source of a spring.

KUBRAK, n.: outer clothing, coat (usually of coarse material); from Old Ukr. kubrák: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (SWO, SD), first attested in 1612 (F. Sławski, Język Polski, 11, 1945, p. 92).

KUCJA, n.: see kutia.

KUCZKI, n. plu.: Jewish Feast of Tabernacles; first attested in 1561 in Leopolita's translation of the Bible (L) from Ukr. kúčky: s.m. (V. Machek, Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského, Prague: Československá akademie věd, 1957). In addition to Leopolita and P. Skarga, L also cites S. Budny and M. Strykowski, which means that Belor. influence is also quite possible.

KUKURYDZA, n.: maize, Indian corn, corn; since XVII cen. (L) L also gives the forms kukurudz, kukuruca, kukuryca and B only kukurudza. From Ukr. kukurúdza: s.m. ultimately from Tur. through Rum. The modern Polish form with rydza instead of rudza is possibly due to association with rydz which is yellow like corn seed.

Derivatives:

kukurydz(i)any, kukurydzowy, adj.: of or pertaining to corn.

kukuryda(i)anka, n.: corn flour or porridge.

KUM, n.: 1. crony 2. godfather; either from Tur. or a contraction of PSL. *kǫmotrǫ (V), known only in East Slavic languages and Pol. It is attested in Kievan sources (the oldest stage of Ukr.) in the XIV cen. (K II, 119, 261) but not in Pol. until the XVI cen. (L). In L the first users are M. Bielski and S. Orzechowski, who spent many years in and around Przemyśl. For the sake of accuracy, it must be mentioned that in L, Orzechowski is cited as using kumać się. All of this indicates a borrowing from Ukr. kum: s.m.

Derivatives:

kuma, kumoszka, n.: 1. godmother 2. gossipy old woman, busy-body.

kumać się, v.: 1. be god-parents. 2. hobnob, be cronies.

kumostwo, n.: 1. relationship resulting from being a god-parent.
2. close friendship.

KUPAŁA, n.: St. John's eve's festivities (June 23); since XIX cen. in
Ż. Pauli, Pieśni ludu polskiego w Galicji. Lwów, 1838, from
Ukr. kupá(j)lo: s.m. (SD).

KURDUPEL, n.: runt, shorty, shrimp; since XVII cen. (B) from Ukr.

kurdúpel: s.m. (T. Lehr-Spławiński, ed, Słownik języka polskiego.
Warsaw, 1939).

Derivative:

kurdupelowaty. adj: runtish, dumpy, pint-sized.

KUREŃ, n.: 1. company of Cossacks. 2. Cossack hut; from Ukr. kurin': s.m.
(SWO), ultimately from Tur. (B, SWO, SD), attested since the
XIX cen. (SW).

Derivative:

kureniowy, kurennny, adj.: of or pertaining to a Cossack company
or hut.

KURHAN, n.: mound, elevation of earth (over a grave), knoll; from Ukr.

kurhan: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, SWO, SD), attested in L
since the XVI cen.

KUSZCZ, n.: bush, shrub; since XIX cen. from Ukr. kušč: s.m. (SD).

KUTIA, n.: dish of wheat, honey and poppy seed, Ukrainian Christmas
ritual food; from Ukr. kutjá: s.m. (SWO, SD) attested since the
XIX cen. (SW).

ŁOSZAK, n.: 1. small Tatar horse. 2. young elk; attested in L, from the late XVIII cen. but only with the first meaning from Ukr.

łośák: small or young horse (SD, SWO), ultimately from Tur. (V).

The second meaning developed in Pol. through folk etymology with łoś: elk.

ŁOTOK, n.: trough of boards for directing water on a millwheel, mill-course; since the XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. lotoký: s.m. (SD).

ŁYPAC', v.: glance quickly or furtively; since XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr.

hlýpaty: s.m. (B).

MAKUTRA, n.: utensil for crushing poppy seed; since XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. makítra: s.m. (SW). The u in Pol. is best explained by assuming the word was borrowed when pronounced *makōtra < PSl. *makotara. It is also interesting to note that L defines makutra as "in the Ukraine, a container for crushing poppy seed."

MALEN'KI, adj.: tiny, wee: since the late XVII and early XVIII centuries (L). Here we are dealing not with one specific loanword, but with the diminutive adjectival suffix -en'k- which entered Pol. under both Ukr. and Belor. influence (S. Urbańczyk, Sprawozdanie z czynności i posiedzeń polskiej akademii umiejętności, Cracow, 1945, pp. 16-7).

Derivative:

malen'stwo, n.: term of endearment used in reference to children or pets.

MAMAŁYGA, n.: corn meal, homeny; from Ukr. mamalyga: s.m., ultimately from Rum. (B, SWO, SD), attested since the XIX cen. (SD).

MANOWCE, n. plu.: tractless area, wilderness; since the early XVIII cen. in S. Klonowic and S. Zimorowicz from Ukr. manivcí: s.m.

(Hr 68). The presence of o in Pol. instead of i is best explained by the fact that in the early XVII cen. the Ukr. word still had a diphthong, i.e., *manōvci.

MAZEPA, n.: 1. crybaby, fidget, naught, dirty child, 2. any dirty or ugly person; since the late XVIII in L but only with meaning 2 from the "Ukr. surname Mazépa with folk etymology to the verb mazać" (SW), more likely from Ukr. common noun mazépa: dirty fellow.

MEREŻKA, n.: himstitch, decorative border; from Ukr. meréžka: s.m. (SD, SW, SWO), first attested in SW, 1908.

Derivatives:

mereżkarka, n.: one who does hemstitching.

mereżkarski, adj.: of or pertaining to one who does hemstitching or makes lace.

mereżkować, v.: himstitch, make lace.

mereżkowy, adj.: of or pertaining to mereżka.

MOHORYCZ, n.: drink to seal a bargain, treat of liquor; from Ukr.

mohoryč: s.m. (SWO), ultimately from Arabic through Tur. (B, SWO, SD) first attested in the XIX cen. (SW).

MOŁODYCA, n.: young woman (especially a Ukr. or Belor. woman); first appears in B. Zimorowicz of Lwów, 1597-1677, (L), from Ukr.

molodycja: s.m. (SD).

MOŁODYCIA, n.: 1. young woman, 2. Cossack's sweetheart; another form of mołodyca, q.v. yet a separate borrowing appearing in H. Sienkiewicz, 1846-1916, from Ukr. molodycja: young woman (SD).

MOŁODZICA, n.: young woman; another form of mołodyca, q.v., yet a separate borrowing first attested in 1880 in J. Chodźko from

Ukr. molodycja: s.m. (SD)

MOŁODZIEC, n.: young Cossack, warrior; another form of mołojec, q.v.

In L the form mołodziec is attested from 1607, but later disappeared. It was reintroduced in 1848 by A. Groza (SD) from Ukr. molodéc': young man.

MOŁOJEC, n.: 1. young Cossack, warrior. 2. dashing young man, dare-devil; since XVI cen. (L) from Ukr. molodéc': young man (SD). The earliest form of this borrowing mołodec appears in J. Kochanowski, 1530-1584; M. Strykowski, 1547-1582 used both mołodec and mołojec. The forms mołodziec, and mołojdziec were also current at that time (L).

Derivative:

mołojeczki, adj.: young, dashing, dare-devilish, fearless, Cossack-like.

MONASTER, n.: monastery of the Orthodox Church: from Ukr. mo(a)nastýr: s.m., ultimately from Greek (SWO). In L the earliest attestation appears in the form manastyrski from K. Sakowicz, 1640. Forms with o in the first syllable appeared later in the XVIII cen.

MORDA, n.: snort, ugly face, or mouth (of an animal); since XVIII cen. (L) from Ukr. mórda: s.m. (JRoz 381). JRoz also admits the possibility of Belor. influence, and this is supported by the quotations in L.

Derivatives:

mordobicie, n.: fist fight.

moczymorda, n.: tippler, one who likes to drink.

mordeczka, n.: dim. of morda.

MUŻYK, n.: peasant (especially in pre-revolution Russia); since the XVII cen. (L, Hr 120). L cites K. Sakowicz and Hr. cites B. Zimorowicz, both of whom were Galicians. It comes from Ukr. mużýk: s.m. (Hr 120, SW).

NA POHYBEL, adv.: to destruction, to damnation; from Ukr. na pohýbel': s.m. (B, SD), attested in L since the XVII cen.

Derivative:

pohybelnik, n.: bog, swamp.

NADWEREŻYĆ, v.: impair, tax, strain (especially of health): since XVII cen. from East Slavic in the form nadweredzić, (B), obviously from Ukr. nadveredyty: s.m. as is proved by the non-palatalized v. The same root is preserved in both Russ. and Belor. but not with the prefix nad.

NAHAJKA, n.: whip, knout; from Ukr. nahájka: s.m. (B, SWO) attested in L since the XVI cen. The ultimate source is Tur. (B, V).

Derivative:

nahajkowy, adj.: of or pertaining to a whip.

NIEZABUDKA, n.: forget-me-not (flower); since the late XVIII cen. in Czempinski from Ukr. nezabúd'ka: s.m. (SW).

Derivative:

niezabudkowy, adj.: of or pertaining to forget-me-not.

OCHAJTNAĆ(SIE), v.: bring to order, clean up, gather up put on clean clothing; since XX cen. from Ukr. adj. oxájnyj: neat, tidy (SD).

OCHOCZY, adj.: eager, willing; since the XVII cen. in J. Wargocki of

Przemysł and I. Krasicki of the Sanok region (L) under the influence of Ukr. oxóčyj: s.m. (YS 340), an example of a phonetic contamination with č instead of c. According to YS, such contaminations took place before the XIV cen.

OCZAJDUSZA, n.: devil-may-care, reckless or heedless person; from Old Ukr. očajduša: s.m. (B, SD). It is first attested in the XIX cen. in B. Zaleski (SW).

OCZERET, n.: reed(s), reedbank; from Ukr. očerét: s.m. (SWO, SD), first attested in SWil, 1861.

Derivative:

oczeretni, adj.: reedy, reed-like.

ODZIEŻ, n.: clothing; the earliest attestation is from 1595 in S. Klonowic, who spent most of his life in Lwów and Lublin (Hr 61); it also appears in S. Petrycy (L) and W. Potocki (B) both of Lwów. In all these early attestations, we have the form odzieża under the influence of Ukr. oděža: s.m. (Hr 62, and Vondrak, Vergleichende slavische Grammatik, Göttingen, 1924, I, pp. 507, 627-628). Here only the syllable *ž is Ukr.; the root *odě- exists in many Slavic languages. Odzieża merely displaced older Pol. odziedza (B). Final a was dropped in imitation of kradzież, sprzedaż, etc. (B).

Derivatives:

odzieżowiec, n.: worker in a clothing factory, garment worker.

odzieżownictwo, n.: clothing or garment industry.

odzieżowy, adj.: of or pertaining to clothing.

OHYDA, n.: abomination, hideousness; since XVI cen. (B) from Ukr. ohýda:

s.m., see hydzić.

Derivatives:

ohydnicą, n.: abominable woman, "battle-axe."

ohydny, adj.: abominable, hideous.

ohydzać, v.: see hydzić.

OŁADKA, n.: small cake of flour or mashed potatoes fried in lard;

from late XIX cen. (SD) from Ukr. oládok or oládka: s.m. (B, SW).

OPONĆZA, n.: cape, cloak without sleeves; from Tur. attested in Kievan sources in the XII cen. as japončyca or jepanča (V, KII 139, 147).

In Pol. it appears only in the XVII cen. where its earliest users are S. Rysiński from Belorussia and W. Potocki of Lwów. Therefore, we can assume a borrowing from either Ukr. or Belor. but more likely from Ukr. opančá: s.m., than Belor. apančá: s.m., which displays akanije. Only Pol. and Ukr. share initial o.

Derivative:

oponczowy, adj.: of or pertaining to a cloak.

OPRYSZEK, n.: robber, highwayman, freebooter (especially in the Carpathian Mountains); since early XVII cen. (A. Bruckner, Walka o język. Lwów, 1917, p. 258) from Ukr. opryśók: s.m. (SD).

OSEŁEDEC, n.: long braid or scalp lock as worn by the Cossacks; since the XIX cen. (SW) from Ukr. oselédéc': herring (SD)

The change in meaning is difficult to explain - humor or sarcasm?

PIERWSZE, adv.: only in the expression "pierwsze słyszę": that's news to me; since XIX cen. (SW) under the influence of Ukr. (v)perše: first, for the first time (W. Słuszkiewicz, Poradnik Językowy, 9, 1953). The adaption of this Ukr. form of

an adv. in this expression was undoubtedly aided by the fact that pierwsze and słyszę rhyme since ę is generally denasalized in colloquial speech.

POBEREŻ(Ź)NIK, n.: ranger, forester; since early XIX cen. (L) from Ukr. poberežnyk: s.m. (SD). See also zberežnik.

POBEREŻE, n.: 1. territory located at the limits of something 2. area of land along the Dniester; since the XIX cen. (SWil) from Ukr. poberežžja: coast, embankment (SD).

POBRATYMIEC, n.: kin, close friend; since XIX cen. in Swil, 1861, although pobratym appears as early as the XVI - XVII centuries in Bielski, Stryjowski, B. Zimorowicz, etc. (L) from Ukr. pobratým: s.m. (Hr 120).

Derivatives:

pobratymca, n.: kinsman, close friend.

pobratymczy, adj.: relating to kin.

pobratymstwo, n.: kinship, friendship.

POHANIEC, n.: heathen, nonbeliever (usual in reference to Moslems); since XVI and XVII centuries (B) from Ukr. pohánec': 1. pagan. 2. nasty fellow (SD), ultimately from Latin (B, V).

Derivatives:

pohańczy, adj.: heathen, pagan.

pohaństwo, n.: paganism.

POHANY, adj.: bad, miserable, obnoxious; since XIX cen. (SW) from Ukr. pohányj: s.m. (SD) ultimately from Latin (B).

POŁONINA, n.: mountain pasture valley (in the Carpathians); first attested by SW in M. Konopnicka, 1842-1910, from East Slavic (B),

obviously from Ukr. polonýna: s.m. since it refers to a specific area where there are no Russians or Belorussians. Lack of akanije also indicates a Ukrainianism.

POROHY, n., plu.: rapids in the Dnieper; from Ukr. poróhy: s.m. (SD, SWO).

In B defined as an East Slavicism, it is obviously a Ukrainianism since it refers specifically to the rapids on the Dnieper. In L it is attested since the XVII cen.

PRAWOSŁAWNY, adj.: Orthodox, Byzantine rite; it entered Pol. as a result of the polemic literature of the XVI - XVII cen. In L the earliest attestation are in P. Skarga, 1579, and P. Mohyla, 1644, from Ukr. pravoslávnyj: s.m.

PROWODYR, n.: leader (of thieves, rogues, etc.), ringleader; from Ukr. provodýr: guide, leader (SWO). It is first attested in 1753 (A. Bruckner, Walka o język. Cracow, 1917, p. 255).

PROSKURA, n.: consecrated bread (in Byzantine rite), host; since XVII cen. through religious polemic literature (B) from Ukr. próskura: s.m., ultimately from Greek (SWO).

PRYSIUDY, n., plu.: step in Ukrainian dances, squatting jump; in L the earliest attestation is from 1780 in Zabłocki, a native of Volhynia, in the form prysidy which obviously is from Ukr. prýsidy: s.m. The form prysiudy appears for the first time in J. Słowacki (SW), also a Volhynian, from dial. Ukr. prýsjudy: s.m.

PUCHACZ (puhacz until 1936), n.: horned owl; since XV cen. (B) from Ukr. puháč: s.m. (SWO).

Derivative:

puchaczę, n.: young horned owl.

RACUSZKI, n., plu.: fried buckwheat pancake; since XVIII cen.

(L) from Ukr. hřečušký: s.m. (B). In L we have only the forms hreczuszeki and reczuszeki. Later h disappeared completely and c underwent mazurzenie (B).

RAMOTA, n.: any type of scribbling, a poor piece of write, novel, play, etc.; since the XIX cen. in the present meaning but originally any written document, from Ukr. hrámota: document, charter (B).

REZUN(Ń), n.: murderer, cutthroat, butcher; first attested in SW in J. Słowacki, a Volhynian, but in the form rzezun. The form rezun appears later in K. Libelt and K. Jarochowski where the latter uses it in referring to Ukr. insurgents during the rebellion of Palij, from Ukr. rizún: s.m. (SW). The initial re instead of ri possibly reflects a borrowing from northwestern Ukr. dialects.

ROHATYNA, n.: halbred, light spear; since XV cen. (B) from Ukr.

rohátyna: s.m. (SWO). Defined in B as an East Slavicism, it is obviously an Ukrainianism, for h excludes Russ., the absence of cekanije excludes Belor., and the absence of akanije excludes them both.

Derivative:

rohatyniec, n.: spear-man.

ROBOCZY, adj.: (of) work, labour; since the XIV cen. under the influence of Ukr. robóczyj: s.m. (YS 340, J. Łoś, Krótką gramatyka historyczną języka polskiego, Lwów: 1927, p. 62). In L the earliest attestation is from the mid XVIII cen.

ROZHOWORY, n.: plu.: talks, parley; from Ukr. dial. rozhovóry: s.m. (SWO), attested in L since the XVII cen.

RUMAK, n.: charger, warhorse, steed; both Ukr. and Pol. show identical phonetic developments from the Tur. arğamak (V). So great are these changes that they could not have taken place independently. The deciding factor here is accent; in no case does a Pol. loanword in Ukr. appear with final stress (R. Richhardt, Polnische Lehnwörter im Ukrainischen, Wiesbaden : 1951, pp. 26-28). In view of Ukr. rumák, gen. sing. rumaká, the borrowing is from Ukr. to Pol. (B, Hr 46-7), not vice-versa. In its earliest attestations in Pol. in Rej rumak appears in the forms ochromak, ohromak, hromak (ibid.). This can only be explained by assuming the following development in Ukr. First the short a's of arğamak became o (M. Hruns'kyj, P. Koval'ov, Narysy z istoriji ukrajins'koji movy, L'viv, 1941, pp. 49-50); then initial o was dropped (witness, ohoród > horód, or the doublets ókrim || krím; oprič || prič); initial rh, being unnatural in Ukr. simplified to r. The u developed as a result of ukannja (F. Žylko, Narysy z dialektolohiji ukrajins'koji movy. Kiev, 1955, pp. 93, 160). In summary, that is, arğamak > *orhomak > *rhomak > *romak > rumak. Pol. borrowed it in the second stage; The metathesis of r and h (ch) must have taken place in Pol. only since *hr would not have been simplified in Ukr. It is also obvious that modern Pol. was further influenced by the developments in Ukr. or re-borrowed the word at a later date. It appears in its present form since the end of the XVI (B).

RUSAŁKA, n.: water nymph, sprite; since the XIX cen. in Mickiewicz, Słowacki, born in Ukr. ethnic territory, and L. Golebiowski of

Polesie (SW). In Słowacki we also have the forms rusałeczka, rusańczany, rusańczanka which shows that he was quite conversant with the word and operated with it freely. According to K. Moszyński, Atlas kultury ludowej w Polsce, Cracow, 1934-6, Zeszyt 2, p. 6, the name rusałka originated in the Ukraine in the second half of the preceding millennium. This would mean that rusałka is a Ukr. borrowing in all other Slavic languages. Even in view of its first users, we can assume a Ukrainianism with some help from Belor.

SADYBA, n.: abode, home (with garden); from Ukr. sadyba: s.m. (SWO), attested in L from 1801 in T. Czacki of Volhynia.

SAHAJDAK, n.: quiver; since XVII cen. (B) from Ukr. sahajdák: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (B, SWO).

SAJDAK, n.: quiver; another form of sahajdak, q.v.

SERDAK, n.: sleeveless fur jacket; since XVI cen. (B) from Ukr. serdák: s.m. (SWO).

SICZ, p.m.: main camp or stronghold of the Cossack; from Ukr. Sič: s.m. (B, SWO), attested in L since the XVII cen.

SIELANKA, n.: idyll; since 1612 when it was first used by S.

Szymonowicz of Lwów to designate a definite literary genre, from Ukr. seljáńka: village woman or maiden (B, Hr 86).

The palatalized s' can be explained as a phonetic contamination with older Pol. forms siodłak, siodłaczka (B) or by assimilation to sielski, q.v.

Derivatives:

sielankarz, sielankopisarz, n.: writer, creator of idylls.

sielankowy, adj.: idyllic, bucolic.

SIELSKI, adj.: rural, bucolic, idyllic; since 1612 in S. Szymonowicz from Ukr. sil'skyj: s.m. (Hr, 86). The Pol. form with sie - instead of si- is best explained by assuming that the word was borrowed at the time when PSl. ě had a diphthongal quality in Ukr. or from a northern dialect where this phonemon still exists. We can also assume phonetic contamination with older Pol. forms as with sielanka, q.v. It should be mentioned that there is an earlier attestation for sielski in L from 1582 in M. Strykowski; here we can assume a Belor. borrowing.

SPATKI, diminutive of the v. spać: to sleep, used humorously or in baby-talk; since XIX cen. (SW) formed under the influence of Ukr. diminutive v. spátky, spáton'ky, spatúni s.m. (SW, B. Kreja, Język Polski, I, 1957, p. 49).

STEP, n.: steppe land, prairie; from Ukr. step: s.m. (SWO).

B defines it merely as an East Slavicism although it is obviously a Ukrainianism. In both Ukr. and Pol., step is masculine and of the hard declension in contrast to Russ. where it is fem. and soft. Pol., therefore, must have adopted step from Ukr., for the soft declension with labials is possible in Pol., for example, karp, karpia; głab, głębi. The Belor. form stèp, stèpu (instead of *scep) is obviously itself a borrowing. It is attested in L since the XVIII cen.

Derivatives:

stepak, n.: horse of the steppe.

stepowiec, n.: resident of the steppe, prairie dweller.

stepowy, adj.: relating to the steppe, prairie.

STERTA, n.: stack, heap; from dial. Ukr. stýrta; s.m. (B). The substitution of y and e before r corresponds to the normal Polish phonological development, for example, ser, szeroki for PSl. *syrrę, *šyrokę. It is attested in L since the early XVII cen.

Derivatives:

stertarz, n.: stacker, one who piles sheaves into stacks.

stertnik, n.: a machine for stacking.

stertować, v.: stack or pile sheaves.

SURMA, n.: trumpet, bugle; since XVI cen. in Rej, from Ukr. surmá: s.m. (Hr 46-47, J. Janów, Język Polski, II, 1947, p. 169), ultimately from Tur. surna (B,V). Only Ukr. and Pol. have m instead of n.

Derivative:

surmacz, n.: bugler, trumpeter.

SZAŁAWIŁA, n.: scatterbrain; since XVII cen. in J. Gawiński, raised near Brześć, (L) and W. Potocki, a native of Lwów (SW), from Ukr. šalawýła: s.m. (SW).

SZARAŃCZA, n.: locust, grasshopper; since 1549 from Ukr. sarančá: s.m. (Hr 46-7, T. Kowalski, Język Polski, I, 1947, 52, 54-5) ultimately from Tur. (B, V) with false odmazurzenie in Pol.

Derivative:

szarańczak, n.: grasshopper.

SZARAWARY, n. plu.: broad Oriental trousers; since XVI cen. (B, L, Hr 42-43, 75) often with the first r replaced by l or ł from Ukr. šaraváry: s.m. (SW, SWO). The etymology of this word

still remains unexplained; Hung., Tur., or Persian have all been suggested (B, SWO, Hr 42-43).

TABUN, n.: herd (of horses); from Ukr. tabún: band, drove, herd, pack, ultimately from Tur. (B, SWO), attested in L since the XVII cen.

Derivative:

tabunowy, adj.: relating to a herd.

TAJSTRA, n.: bag, sack (especially for game); since the XVI-XVII centuries (B) from Old Ukr. tájstra: s.m., ultimately from Rum. (SWO).

TARABAN, n.: drum (especially a large, military drum); since the late XVII cen. (SW) from Tur. daraban (V), obviously through Ukr. tarabán: s.m., since the change of d to t is common only to Ukr. and Pol.

Derivative:

tarabanić, v.: drum, tap, beat out a rhythm.

TELEPAĆ(SIE), v.: jolt, knock; from East Slavic (B), obviously from Ukr. telepaty(sja): s.m. since it is not attested in either Russ. or Belor. It appears in L but without references.

TRUTEN', n.: 1. drone 2. lazy or useless person; first attested in M. Smotryc'kyj, 1622 (A. Bruckner, Walka o język, Lwów, 1917, p. 256) from Ukr. trúten' (J. Reczek, Język Polski, XLIV, 5, pp. 276-282).

UKRAINIEC, p.n.: Ukrainian; since the early XVII cen. (L) from Ukr. ukrajinec': s.m. (H. Ułaszyn, Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Wydział I : językoznawstwo, nauki o literaturze i filozofii, No. 1, 1947, pp. 1-14) which replaced the native Pol. form Ukraińczyk also attested in L.

UPIÓR, n.: vampire; in L the earliest attestations are from the XVIII cen. but according to J.B. Bystron', Dzieje obyczajów w dawnej Polsce wieku XVI-XVIII Warsaw, 1932-4, Vol. 1, p. 306, the word was known as early as the XVI cen. He also states that "upiór was the name known mostly in the southwest; in the west people used the words strzyga and wieszczyca" (ibid.) The origin of the Pol. word is from the Ukr. upýr: s.m. (B, V).

Derivatives:

upiorny, adj.: ghastly, nightmarish.

upiorzyca, n.: vampiress.

WAŁACH, n.: gelding; from Ukr. váľax: any castrated animal, castrator (SWO), attested in L since the XVIII cen.

Derivative:

wałaszyć, v.: castrate, geld.

WATAHA, n.: gang, band (of marauders); since XVII cen. in B.

Zimorowicz, W. Potocki, and Pasek (L) from Ukr. vataha: s.m., ultimately from Tur. (SWO).

WATAŻKA, n.: chieftan, leader of a wataha; first attested in SWil, 1861, according to SWO from Ukr. *vatažka although no such form is attested in Ukr. More likely it is from Ukr. vatažkó: s.m. The change of ko to ka is quite possible in Pol. since masc. n. in o are declined as fem., and masc., n. in a are more common in Pol. than in Ukr.

WERESZKA, n.: broken arrow, arrow with no head; since XVII cen. in W. Potocki (L), according to B from "East Slavic wereta, a cover". If this etymology is correct, it is obvious from Ukr. veréta:

covering, mantel, as the nonpalatalized y proves, but the suffix -szka and, above all, the change of meaning are very difficult to explain.

WERTEPY, n., plu.: obstacles (in a road), impassable road;
since XVII cen. (B) from Ukr. vertép(y): cavern, cave, den;
crèche; marionette theatre (B, SWO).

WIEDŹMA, n.: witch, hag; since the XVI cen. but in the forms wiedma or less commonly widma. According to B "... wiedma was the form constantly used throughout the XVII cen.", and this is supported by quotations in L. The i in widma proves it a Ukrainianism without question, and according to Hr, 86 and Bruckner, Walka o język, Cracow, 1917, p. 258, wiedma also is from Ukr., each form being taken from different dialects representing different phases in the development of PSl.ǫ. The form wiedźma triumphed only in the XIX cen. (SWil, SW). However, wiedzma is also attested once in J. Kochanowski (L). This indicates that the etymon *vedama existed in Pol. as well as in Czech and East Slavic (V). For the XVI cen., wiedźma would be the normal phonological development for *vĕdama (Z. Stieber, Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego, Warsaw, 1958, pp. 11-12, 19, 63-64). Wiedzma apparently fell into disuse later on and was forgotten which necessitated a borrowing from another language.

WŁADYKA, n.: dignitary of the Orthodox Church; from Ukr. vladyka: bishop, metropolitan (SWO), ultimately from Church Slavic (B), attested in L since the XVI cen.

WYKARASKAĆ SIĘ, v.: get out of or away from, escape; extricate oneself;
the most common form of the verb karaskać się, q.v.

WYKIDAJŁO, n.: bouncer in a saloon or tavern; this word is not attested in any Pol. or Ukr. dictionary but was commonly used in Lwów before World War II and is still heard in Warsaw slang (personal information from Prof. M. Szymczak, Department of Polish, University of Warsaw), obviously from dial. Ukr. as yet unregistered in any dictionary or developed by Pol. speakers in imitation of Ukr.

ZABIJAKA, n.: brawler, swashbuckler; in L and SWil, we have only the truly Pol. form zabijak. SW cites zabijaka in I. Kraszewski, who lived many years in Volhynia and from H. Sienkiewicz's Ogniem i mieczem where many Ukrainianisms are used for local color. The new suffix ak+a is obviously influenced by the Ukr. zabyjaka: s.m.

ZAWADIAKA, n.: brawler, trouble-maker, bully, pest; first attested in L from 1780 in F. Zabłocki of Volhynia. L also cites examples from a few years earlier but in the forms zawadiak, zawadyak, zawadyacki, "all of which come from East Slavic" (B), obviously based on the Ukr. zavodijaka: inciter, ringleader, since only Ukr. possesses a form combining the verb zavódyty: lead, start, instigate, with the suffix -ak+a. The Pol. form was obviously influenced by the verb zawadzać: hinder, annoy, hamper, which explained the slight changes in meaning and substitution of a for o in the second syllable.

Derivatives:

zawadiacki, adj.: bullying, blustering, relating to a trouble-maker.

zawadiactwo, n.: aggressiveness, bravado.

ZBEREŻNIK, n.: joker, rogue, roué; "it came from pobereże (in Podolia) which was famous for its roughnecks and hooligans in the XVI and XVII centuries. Every troublemaker or anyone else who was at odds with the law went there." (B). Therefore, zbereżnik is a calque formed either in imitation of Ukr. phonetic patterns or on the basis of Ukr. pobereżnyk: forester, ranger. Zbereżnik is first attested in SW from the late XIX cen.

Derivatives:

zbereżny, adj.: roguish, shameless, dissolute.

zbereżeństwo, n.: dissolute way of life.

ZNACHOR, n.: quack (doctor), medicine man; first attested in SWil, 1861, with the remark: "in the southwestern regions and Galicia". In SW the earliest quotations are from J. Kraszewski, who spent many years in Volhynia, and from T. Jeż of Podolia. Obviously, it is from Ukr. znáxar: s.m.

Derivatives:

znachorka, n.: female quack.

znachorski, adj.: quackish, pseudo-medical.

znachorstwo, n.: quachery.

ŻUBR, n.: European bison, buffalo; according to V in PSl., this word has two variant, namely, *zqbrę and *zqbrę. In Pol. this should give zabr or zabrz, and this is what we find in XV-XVII cen. Pol. sources. Żubr is first attested in Knapski, 1621, (L). The

newer form is due to the influence of Ukr. (and Belor.) zubr: s.m. (Hr 20-2, JRoz 363-4, YS, 333). The z in the Pol. form is due to false odmazurzenie (B).

Derivatives:

żubrowy, adj.: relating to bison.

żubrówka, n.: type of vodka.

żubrzątko, n.: buffalo calf, young bison.

żubrzyca, n.: female bison, buffalo cow.

żubrzyzna, n.: buffalo meat.

The preceding vocabulary contains 561 words; of these 7 merely indicate a cross-reference, 293 are derivatives, and the remaining 261 are direct Ukrainian loanwords in Polish. Of this latter group 98 are not indigenous in Ukrainian; their actual origin is varied: 63 are from Turkic, 7 from Rumanian, 6 from Greek, 5 from Persian, 3 from Arabic, 2 from Latin, 1 from Italian, and 11 are of undetermined origin.

It is also interesting to analyze this group of direct loanwords on the basis of the date of their first appearance in the Polish language. This date was impossible to establish for 3 of the borrowings; for the remaining 253, however, the situation is: 3 borrowings during the fourteenth century, 10 in the fifteenth, 52 in the sixteenth, 74 in the seventeenth, 45 in the eighteenth, 71 in the nineteenth, and 3 in the twentieth.

A Bibliography

Books

- Adalberg, S. Księgi przysłów. Warsaw: E. Sliwski, 1889-1894.
- Bajmut, T., Bojčuk, M., Volyns'kyj, M., Žovtobryjux, M., Malyna, T., Samijlenko, S. Porivnjal'na hramatyka ukrajins'koji i rosijs'koji mov. Kiev: Radjans'ka škola, 1957.
- Baugh, A.C. A History of the English Language. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts. Inc., 1957.
- Bernštejn, S.B. Očerok spavnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskix jazykov. Moscow: Akademija Nauk SSSR, 1961.
- Bevzenko, S.P. Istoryčna morfolohija ukrajins'koji movy. Užhorod: Zakarpats'ka oblasne vydavnytvo, 1960.
- Bezpal'ko, O.P., Bojčuk, M.K., Žovtobryjux M.A., Samijlenko S.P. Istoryčna hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy. Kiev: Radjans'ka škola, 1962
- Bidwell, C.E. Slavic Historical Phonology in Tabular Form. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1963.
- Bilodid, J.K. Kurs istoriji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy. Kiev: Akademija Nauk Ukr. RSR, I, 1958.
- Borkovskij, V.I., Kuznecov, P.S. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Moscow: Akademija Nauk SSSR, 1963.
- Bruckner, A. Cywilizacja i język. Szkice z dziejów obyczajowości polskiej. Warsaw: K. Kowalski, 1901.
- _____. Dzieje języka polskiego. Lwów: Towarzystwo Nauczycieli Szkół Wyższych we Lwowie, 1906.
- _____. Mikołaj Rej. Studium krytyczne. Cracow: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1905.
- _____. Walka o język. Lwów: Książnica Polska, 1917.
- Bystron', J.B. Dzieje obyczajów w dawnej Polsce, wiek XVI-XVIII. Warsaw: Trzasko, Evert i Michalski, 1932-1934.
- Chevalier, P. Histoires de la guerre des Cosaques contre Pologne avec un discours de leur origine, pays, moeurs, gouvernement et religion, et un autre des Tartara précopètes. Paris: Claude Barbin, 1663.

- Costas, P.S. An Outline of the History of the Greek Language.
Chicago: The Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in America, 1936.
- Dorošenko, D. History of the Ukraine. Edmonton: Institute Press, 1939.
- Doroszewski, W. Język T.T. Jeża. Warsaw: Nakład Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego, 1949.
- Dudziński, M. Zbiór rzeczy potrzebniejszych do wydoskonalenia się w ojczystym języku służących. Wilno, 1776.
- Dvornik, F. The Slavs in European History and Civilization. New Brunswick, New Jersey. Rutgers University Press, 1962.
- Głowacka, Alicja. Rozważania Księcia A.K. Czartoryskiego nad kształtowaniem się języka polskiego. Praca magisterska, Uniwersytet Warszawski, 1958.
- Górnicki, L. Dworzanin polski. Cracow: Maciej Wirzbieta, 1566.
- Halecki, O. A History of Poland. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1955.
- Hens'ors'kyj, A.I. Halyc'ko - volyns'kyj litopys. Kiev: Akademiya Nauk Ukr. RSR, 1961.
- Hlebka, P.F. (ed.) Narysy pa historyi belaruskaj movy. Minsk: Akademiya navuk Belor. SSR, 1957.
- Horbatsch, O. Die vier Ausgaben der kirchenslavischen Grammatik von M. Smotryc'kyj. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964.
- Hrabec, S. Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy XVI i XVII w. Toruń: Nakład Towarzystwa Naukowego, 1949.
- Hrabec, S., Peplowski, F. Wiadomości o autorach i dziełach cytowanych w Słowniku Lindego. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1963.
- Hruns'kyj, M.K., Koval'ov, P.K. Narysy z istoriji ukrajins'koji movy. L'viv: Ukrajins'ke vydavnytvo, 1941.
- Hrushevsky, M. A History of Ukraine. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.
- Humec'ka, L.L. Narys slovotvorčoji systemy ukrajins'koji aktovoji movy XIV-XV st. Kiev: Akademia Nauk Ukr. RSR, 1958.
- Ilarion, Mytropolyt [I. Ohijenko]. Istorija ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy. Winnipeg: Naša kul'tura, 1950.
- _____. Naša literatura mova: jak pysaty j hovoryty po-literaturnomu. Winnipeg: Naša kul'tura, 1958.

- Ivanov, V.V. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Moscow: Prosveščeniye, 1964.
- Jakubinskij, L. Istorija drevnerusskogo jazyka. Moscow: Glavpoligrafizdat, 1953.
- Kleczewski, S. O początku, dawności, odmianach y wydoskonaleniu języka polskiego zdania. Lwów, 1767.
- Klemensiewicz, Z., Lehr-Spławiński, T., Urbanczyk, S. Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1955.
- Klich, E. Polska terminologia chrześcijańska. Poznań: Nakładem Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 1927.
- Knapski, G. Thesaurus Polono-Latino-Graecus. Cracow, 1621.
- Koźłataj, H. Stan oświecenia w Polsce w ostatnich latach panowania Augusta III (1750-1764) z przedmową Henryka Mościckiego. Warsaw: Gebethner i Wolff, 1905.
- Kostiuk, H. Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960.
- Kovaliv, P. Leksyčnyj fond literaturnoji movy kyjivs'koho periodu X-XIV st. New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, Inc., Vol. I, 1962, Vol. II, 1964.
- _____. Slovjans'ki fonemy : pochożennja i istoryčnyj rozvytok. New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1965.
- Kridl, M. A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture. The Hague: Mouton & Company, 1955.
- Kucyj, M. Užynok ridnoho polja. Moscow: Drukarnja Katkova i tovarystva, 1857.
- Kuraszkiewicz, W. Zarys dialektologii wschodniosłowiańskiej. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1963.
- Lehr-Spławiński, T. Język polski; pochodzenie, powstanie, rozwój. Warsaw: S. Arct, 1951.
- _____. Studia i szkice wybrane. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1957.
- Lehr-Spławiński, T., Piwarski, K., Wojciechowski, Z. Polska-Czechy. Dziesięć wieków sąsiedztwa. Katowice - Wrocław: Instytut Śląski, 1949.
- Lehr-Spławiński, T., Zwoliński, P., Hrabec, S. Dzieje języka ukraińskiego w zarysie. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1956.

- Łos', J. Krótką gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego. Lwów: Biblioteka Slawistyczna, 1927.
- Lower, A.R.M. Colony to Nation. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company, 1957.
- Manteuffel, T. (ed.) Historia Polski. Warsaw: Polska Akademia Nauk, Instytut Historii, 1958.
- Martel, A. La langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes, Ukraine et Russie Blanche, 1569-1667. Lille: Travaux et Mémoires de l'Univ. de Lille, Nouveaux Series, Droits et Lettres XX, 1938.
- Mayenowa, M.R. (ed.) Wypowiedzi o języku i stylu w okresie staropolskim. Wrocław: Ossolineum, II (1963).
- Medvedjev, F.P. Narysy z ukrajins'koji istoryčnoji hramatyky. Kharkiv: Vydavnyctvo Xarkivs'koho universytetu, 1964.
- Merczyng, H. Szymon Budny, jako krytyk tekstów biblijnych. Cracow: Akademia Umiejętności, 1913.
- Moszyński, K. Atlas kultury ludowej w Polsce. Cracow: Akademia Umiejętności, 1934-1936.
- Nimčuk, V.V. (ed.) Leksykon slovenoros'kyj Pamvy Beryndy. Kiev: Akademija Nauk Ukr. RSR, 1961.
- Nitsch, K. Studia z historii polskiego słownictwa. Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1948.
- Orzechowski, S. Policyja Królestwa Polskiego na kształt Aristoteles-owych Polityk wypisana...trzema księgami, etc. [Edited with a preface by Count A.T. Dziatyński] (Poznań, 1859).
- Palmer, L.R. Latin Language. London: Faber & Faber, 1954.
- Palmer, R.R. A History of the Modern World. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958.
- Pauli, Ż. Pieśni ludu polskiego w Galicji. Lwów: K. Jabłonski, 1838-1840.
- Pljušč, P.P. Narysy z istoriji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy. Kiev: Radjanska škola, 1958.
- Podhorodecki, L. Sicz. Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 1960.
- Popovyč, D. Hramatyka cerkovno-slovjans'koji movy v ukrajins'kij redakciji. Mundare, Alberta: Vydavnyctvo o.o. Vasylijan, 1958.
- Richhardt, R. Polnische Lehrwörter im Ukrainischen. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1951.

- Rudnyc'kyj, R. Lemberger ukrainische Stadtmundart. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1943.
- Ševal'je, P [Chevalier, P.] Istorija vijny kozakiv proty Pol'sšci. Kiev: Vydavnyctvo Akademija Nauk Ukr. RSR, 1960.
- Skrzedliński, B. Hugo Kołłątaj, jako krzewiciel oświaty. Białystok: Kółko nauczycielskie, 1938.
- Stieber, Z. Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1958.
- _____. Uwagi o języku Wacława Potockiego. Łódź: Łódzkie Towarzystwa Naukowe, 1947.
- Sullivan, M. Our Times, the United States 1900-1925, Vol. V, Over Here 1914-1918. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1933.
- Szober, S. Gramatyka języka polskiego. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, wydanie piąte, 1959.
- Taszycki, W. Wybór tekstów staropolskich XVI-XVIII wieków. Warsaw: Państwowy Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1955.
- Trofymovyč, K.K. Praktykum z porivnjal'noji hramatyky slovjans'kyx mov. L'viv: Vydavnyctvo L'vivs'koho universytetu, 1960.
- Vinokur. T.G. Drevnerusskij jazyk. Moscow: Vyssšaja škola, 1961.
- Voznjak, M. Počatky ukrajins'koji komediji (1619-1819). L'viv: Vsesvitnja biblioteka, 1920.
- _____. Ukrajins'ki pisni v pols'kyx vydannjax XVII st. L'viv: Ukrajins'ke vydavnyctvo, 1937.
- Witkowski, W. Fonetyka leksydonu Pamby Beryndy. Cracow: Nakład Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1964.
- Xudaš, M.L. Leksyka ukrajins'kyx dokumentiv kincja XVI - počatku XVII st. Kiev: Akademia Nauk Ukr. RSR, 1961.
- Zajączkowski, A. Studia orientalistyczne z dziejów słownictwa polskiego. Wrocław: Wrocławska Drukarnia Naukowa, 1953.
- Žiteckij, P. Očerk literaturnoj istorii malorusskogo narečija v XVII v. Kiev: Universytetskaja tipografija, 1889.
- Žylko, F.T. Narysy z dialektolohiji ukrajins'koji movy (Kiev: Radjans'ka škola, 1955.
- Žytec'kyj, P. Narys literaturnoji istoriji ukrajins'koji movy v XVII vici. L'viv: Ukrajins'ke vydavnyctvo, 1941.

Articles

Bruckner, A. "Cywilizacja i język. Szkice z dziejów kultury polskiej," Biblioteka Warszawska, II (1899), pp. 393-408.

_____. "Cywilizacja i język. Szkice z dziejów kultury polskiej," Biblioteka Warszawska, III (1893), pp. 445-455.

_____. "Pieśni polsko-ruskie," Pamiętnik Literacki. Zeszyt II (1911), pp. 193-201.

_____. "Sępa Szarzyńskiego wiersze nieznane," Biblioteka Warszawska, III (1891), pp. 531-552.

_____. "Wpływy języków obcych na język polski," Encyklopedia polska Akademii Umiejętności, II, Sec. 3, part 1 (1915), pp. 138-146.

_____. (in) Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, XVI, pp. 202-224.

Dobrowolski, K. (in) Studia historyczne ku czci S. Kutrzeby. Cracow: Nakładem komitetu, 1938, pp. 201-207.

Hanusz, J. "O wpływie języków wschodnich na słownik języka polskiego," Prace Filologiczne, I (1885), pp. 465-466.

Hryčyšyn, D.H. "Imennykova synonimika v ukrajins'kyx pamjatkax XIV-XV st.," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koj movy, VI (1964), pp. 60-80.

_____. "Iz sposterežen' nad administratyvno-jurydyčnoju leksykoju v ukrajins'kyx hramotax XIV-XV st.," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koj movy, V, (1962), pp. 31-51.

Janów, J. (in) Język Polski, II (1947), pp. 167-171.

Jedlins'ka U. Ja., "Do pytan'ja pro vzajemodiju knyžnyx i narodnyx elementiv v ukrajins'kij movi XVII st.," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koj movy, IV (1961), pp. 52-65.

Klich, E. "Pożyczki ruskie w języku polskim," Slavia Occidentalis VIII, 1929, pp. 430-519.

_____. "Recenzja 'Słownika etymologicznego języka polskiego' Brucknera," Slavia Occidentalis, VII (1927), pp. 493-510.

Kreja, B. (in) Język Polski, I (1957), pp. 48-51.

Kryn'ski, A. "Z dziejów języka polskiego. Objasnienia do rozprawy W.W. Makuševa," Ateneum, I (1879).

Kyrčiv, R.F. "Ukrajins'kyj fol'klor u staropolskij literaturi," Slavistyčnyj zbirnyk. Kiev: Akademiya Nauk Ukr. RSR, 1963.

Lehr-Splawiński, T. "Wzajemne wpływy polsko-ruskie w dziedzinie językowej," Przegląd Współczesny. Cracow: S. Badeni, 1928, pp. 18-50.

_____. "Wzajemne wpływy polsko-ruskie w dziedzinie językowej," Szkice z dziejów rozwoju i kultury języka polskiego. Lwów: Książnica-Atlas, 1938.

Lipiński, T. "Przysłowia i wyrażenia od miast i wsi," Biblioteka Warszawska, IV (1852).

Makušev, V.V. "Sledy russkago vlijanija na pol'skiju pis'mennost'," Slavjanskij sbornik, III Moscow, (1878).

Markovs'kyj, Je.M. "Do charakterystyky movy ukrajins'kyx intermedij XVII-XVIII stolit'," Pytannja istoryčnoho rozvytku ukrajins'koji movy. Kharkiv: Vydavnytvo Xarkivs'koho universytetu, 1962., pp. 100-101.

Maver, G. "Rozważania nad poezją Mikołaja Sępa Szarzyńskiego," Pamiętnik Literacki, Zeszyt, 2 (1957), pp. 308-344.

Nadolski, B. "Ze studiów nad twórczością M. Sępa Szarzyńskiego," Pamiętnik Literacki, Zeszyt, 1 (1930), pp. 1-25.

Nakonečnyj, M.F. "Do vyvčennja procesu stanovlennja j rozvytku fonetyčnoji systemy ukrajins'koji movy," Pytannja istoryčnoho rozvytku ukrajins'koji movy. Kharkiv: Vydavnytvo Xarkivs'koho universytetu, 1962.

Nitsch, K. "O wzajemnym stosunku gwar ludowych i języka literackiego. Wpływ prowincji ruskich na polszczyznę literacką," Język Polski, XIII (1913), pp. 79-83.

_____. "Przyczynki do charakterystyki polskich czechizmów," Sbornik v čest na prof. L. Miletič za sedemdeset godistinata ot roždenie mu. Sofia: Isdanie makedonskija naučen, 1933.

_____. "Wspomnienia," Język Polski, LIX (1959), pp. 350-362.

Onyškevyč, M. "Slova sxidnoslovjans'koho poxodžennja v pol's'kij movi," Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija, 4 (L'viv, 1955), pp. 148-156.

_____. "Sposterežennja nad frazeolohijeju tvoriv J. Vyšens'koho," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy, IV (1961), pp. 126-132.

Panaitescu, P.P. "Legăturile moldo-polono in secolul XV și problema chiliei," Romanoslavica, III (1958), pp. 95-114.

Petrow, A., Žiteckij, P. "Die Niederlage Bogdan Chmelnicki's bei Beresteczko am Flusse Styr, 1651, in poetischer Bearbeitung," Archiv für slavische Philologie, II (1877), pp. 297-307.

- Poljuha, L.M. "Iz sposterežen' nad abstraktnuju leksykoju ukrajins'koji aktovoji movy XIV-XV st.," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy. VI (1964), pp. 109-120.
- Prystupa, P.I. "Refleksy davn'oho nahološeno^o ě na terytoriji zaxidnyx hovoriv ukrajins'koji movy," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy, IV (1961), pp. 145-154.
- _____. "Refleksy davn'oho nahološeno^o o v novyx zakrytyx skladax na terytoriji zaxidnyx hovoriv ukrajins'koji movy," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy, V (1962), pp. 135-142.
- Reczek, V. "Czy istniał przyrostek rzeczownikowy ne? (Na marginesie rutenizmów u języku polskim)," Język Polski, XLIV, 5, pp. 276-282.
- Rozwadowski, J. "Recenzja z wydania 'Dziejów języka polskiego Brucknera,'" Język Polski, XIV (1914).
- Rudzińska, M. "Przyczynek do stosunków językowych polsko-ukraińskich," Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego, IV (1934).
- Šerech-Shevelov, Y. "The Problem of Ukrainian-Polish Linguistic Relations from the Tenth to the Fourteenth," Word, III, No. 4, Slavic Word, No. 1 (December, 1952), pp. 327-349.
- Sinko, T. "Problemy Sępowe," Studia staropolskie. Księga ku czci Aleksandra Brucknera. Cracow: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza, 1928, pp. 457-465.
- Sławski, F. (in) Język Polski, II (1945), pp. 90-96.
- Stieber, Z. "Rol' otidel'nyx dialektov v formirovanii polskogo literaturnogo jazyka," Voprosy jazykoznanija, 3 (May-June, 1956), pp. 42-43.
- Ułaszyn, H. "Pochodzenie etnicznej nazwy 'Ukrainec'," Lodzkie Towarzystwa Naukowe, Wydział I : językoznawstwo, nauki o literaturze filozofii, 1 (1947), pp. 1-14.
- Urbańczyk, S. (in) Sprawozdanie z czynności i posiedzeń polskiej Akademii Umiejętności. Cracow, 1945, pp. 15-18.
- Xudaš, M.L. "Landšaftni nazvy v pamjatках ukrajins'koji aktovoji movy XIV-XV st.," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy, V (1962), pp. 143-157.
- _____. "Vyrobnyčo-profesijna ta administratyvno-jurydyčna leksyka ukrajins'kyx dilovyx dokumentiv kincja XVI-pocātku XVII st.," Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy, II (1960), pp. 86-123.

Zilyns'kij, I. "Vzajemovidnosyny miž ukrajins'koju ta pol's'koju movoju," Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Ševčenko, CLV (1937), pp. 203-215.

Žylko, F.T. "Pytannja fonolohičnoho aspektu v ukrajins'kij dialektolohiji," Dialektolohičnyj bjuleten', VIII (1961), pp. 3-17.

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias

- Arct, M. (ed.) Podręczny słownik języka polskiego. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1957.
- Bruckner, A. Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. Cracow: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza, 1927; 2nd ed. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1957.
- "Czartoryski, Adam Kazimierz, książę," Wielka Encyklopedia Powszechna PWN, II (1963), p. 701.
- Karłowicz, J., Kryński, A., Niedźwiecki, W., Słownik języka polskiego. Warsaw: Kasa imienia Mianowskiego, 1900-1927.
- Krapiva, K.K. (ed.) Belorussko-russkij slovar'. Moscow: Dżarżawnae wydavectva zamežnyx i nacyjanał'nyx słownikaw, 1962.
- Lehr-Spławiński, T. (ed.) Słownik języka polskiego. Warsaw: Trzaska, Evert, Michalski, 1939.
- Linde, S.B. Słownik języka polskiego. Warsaw, 1807-1814; 2nd ed. Lwów: Ossolineum, 1854-1860: photo-offset reprinting of 2nd ed. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1951.
- Machek, V. Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského. Prague: Československá akademie věd, 1957.
- Nitsch, K., Klemensiewicz, A., Urbanczyk, S. (eds.) Słownik staropolski. Warsaw: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1953.
- "Paris, Treaty of (1763)," Encyclopedia Canadiana, XVIII (1958), pp. 105-106.
- Rudnyč'kyj, J. An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language. Winnipeg: UVAN, Vols. I-IV, 1962.
- Rysiewicz, Z. (ed.) Słownik wyrazów obcych. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1954; 2nd ed. 1961.
- Sadnik, L., Aitzetmüller, R. Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten, 's-Gravenhage and Heidelberg: Mouton & Co. and Carl Winter, 1955.
- Sławski, F. Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. Cracow: Towarzystwo Miłośników Języka Polskiego, 1952, Vol. I-II fascicle 3(8).
- Slovar' russkogo jazyka. Moscow: Akademija Nauk SSR, 1957-1961.
- Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Moscow and Leningrad: Akademija Nauk SSSR, Vols. I-XVI (to F), 1950+.

- Sreznevskij, I.I. Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka.
St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaja Akademia Nauk, 1890-1912: 2nd
ed. Graz: Akademische Druck - U. Verlagsanstalt, 1955; 3rd
ed. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej,
1958.
- Tymčenko, Je. Istoryčnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koho jazyka, I. Kharkiv-Kiev:
Deržavne vydavnytvo Ukrajinj-Ukrajinska encyklopedija, I,
1930-32.
- Vasmer, M. Russischer Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg:
Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1953.

B29834